

Federal court in the *United States v. Paramount Pictures* case had the following to say:

"Such uniformity of action spells a deliberately unlawful system, the existence of which is not dispelled by the testimony of interested witnesses that one distributor does not know what another distributor is doing; and there can, in our opinion, be no reasonable inference that the defendants are not all planning to fix minimum prices" (*United States v. Paramount Pictures*, op. cit., p. 337).

On the facts, it seems to me that a thorough investigation of whether the Sherman and Clayton Acts have been or are being violated is in order. In this connection, the question of mergers in the shotgun-shell industry, and of possible relationships between domestic producers and foreign manufacturers of shotgun shells in restraint of trade should also be investigated.

I shall appreciate being informed of such public action as the Federal Trade Commission undertakes.

Sincerely,

HENRY S. REUSS,
Member of Congress.

Indefinite Status

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. THOMAS M. PELLY

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, March 3, 1955

Mr. PELLY. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks, I call to the attention of the House a very disturbing situation which has arisen in my district in connection with the new civil-service

appointment system, referred to, I believe, as the career conditional appointment system, which went into effect in January.

On the surface the technical features of this program point to a definite improvement of the system. However, as is so often the case, when put into practical operation many grave inequities immediately become apparent. I am referring in particular to the unfortunate position in which over 1,000 employees of the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard have been placed through no fault of their own. Many of these employees, having a record of from 3 to 8 years' continuous employment in the yard and with excellent performance records, now find themselves with an indefinite classification, and as such will fall victim to the first reduction in force that comes along, simply because at the time of employment the civil-service register had either been exhausted or was not established. Conversely many other employees with much less length of service and perhaps a lower efficiency rating have been classified as career conditional or in some cases given career status, with all the benefits and protection attendant to these categories.

I have received scores of letters protesting the arbitrary enactment of this new system. Many of the authors of these protests are known to me personally as fine craftsmen and would represent a serious loss to the defense effort should they fall victim to this ill-conceived order. I am asking the Civil Service Commission to review this program to the end that these glaring inequities be corrected.

As further proof of the disturbed condition of the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard, I offer by way of explanation an editorial entitled "Indefinite Status," which appeared on Friday, February 25, 1955, in the *Salute*, a weekly publication of the Puget Sound Naval Shipyard:

INDEFINITE STATUS DISCUSSED

The retention of PSNS employees junior in length of service to shopmates who recently received reduction-in-force notices has given rise to questions about the regulations that authorize this apparent inequity.

In January the Civil Service Commission directed the Navy to replace the indefinite system of appointment with the career system. Under the new regulations indefinite employees who had been hired from the civil-service register were automatically converted to a career or career-conditional status. Other indefinites who may have been hired for similar work but were hired instead by recruiting (off the street), remained in an indefinite status and with lower retention rights. Because indefinite employees are in the lowest retention status they are usually the first to be affected by a reduction in force.

Prior to the adoption of new regulations the Civil Service Commission made no distinction between persons hired off the register and those hired by recruiting. During the Korean buildup registers were exhausted and many employees were hired off the street.

When notice of the new regulations was received the shipyard took every step possible to convert indefinite employees to career or career-conditional status. The conversion procedure requires that the indefinite employee who did not receive appointment from the register must now file and be within reach for appointment before he can be changed to retention group II.

The shipyard is doing little hiring at present and as current registers have many outside applicants it is not expected that conversion of all indefinite employees will be accomplished in the near future.

SENATE

FRIDAY, MARCH 4, 1955

The Chaplain, Rev. Frederick Brown Harris, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Thou Kindly Light, amid the encircling gloom, o'er moor and fen and crag and torrent still lead us on. We do not ask to see life's distant scenes; one step enough for us. We grope forward with uncertain step in a tense time, dark and filled with fears; as men in mad fury, oblivious to the precious prizes of a thousand years, would fain lead the race back to the law of the jungle as they crucify good will. In all the tumult and the shouting and the confusions of these days help us to trust the faithful stars above us and the glow on the far horizon where the gates of dawn await the day of global brotherhood.

Grant us honesty in dealing with our own besetting sins, humility in confessing them, and determination in overcoming them. At this high altar in the temple of public service maintain in us the fidelity of those to whom much has been given, and from whom much will be required. We ask it in the dear Redeemer's name. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. CLEMENTS, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Wednesday, March 2, 1955, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

EXECUTIVE MESSAGES REFERRED

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate messages from the President of the United States submitting sundry nominations, which were referred to the appropriate committees.

(For nominations this day received, see the end of Senate proceedings.)

EXTENSION OF RENEGOTIATION ACT OF 1951—MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following message from the President of the United States,

which was read and referred to the Committee on Finance:

To the Congress of the United States:

I recommend extension of the Renegotiation Act of 1951, as amended, to make its provisions applicable for an additional period of 2 years. I make this recommendation because I believe the welfare of the country requires it.

In spite of major improvements which we have achieved in our contracting and price redetermination operations, there nevertheless remains an area in which only renegotiation can be effective to assure that the United States gets what it needs for defense at fair prices. In addition, I believe that the entire period of defense expansion and rebuilding which the United States has undertaken since the beginning of the Korean hostilities should be considered as a whole insofar as renegotiation treatment is concerned.

Continuation of the renegotiation authority is necessary for several reasons. Because of the complex nature of modern military equipment, the lack of experience in producing it and the frequent necessity for alterations during the life of a contract, it is impossible for the Government to determine, when the procurement contract is made, what constitutes a fair price and for the supplier

to forecast accurately his costs. Moreover, because of limited sources of supply in many cases, there are situations in which the Government is unable to obtain the price benefits that accrue from normal competition.

Furthermore, in the interest of broadening and strengthening the mobilization base, we have encouraged the extensive use of subcontracting. Because the United States has no direct contractual relations with the subcontractors, the only protection against unreasonable prices by them is through the process of renegotiation.

All these factors become particularly important when it is recognized that expenditures by the Government during the next 2 calendar years will include paying the bills for the completion of the expansion of the Air Force to 137 wings. The next 2 years also will see an introduction into the Air Force program of the latest type of supersonic aircraft. New types of equipment also are being ordered for the Army, and Navy, and Marine Corps.

As a nation, we recognize that so long as defense expenditures represent more than half of the national budget, we must do everything in our power to see to it that the maximum return is received for each dollar spent. On the other hand we must also be careful not to interfere unwisely in the traditional commercial relationship between the Government and its suppliers. In extending the Renegotiation Act last year, the Congress instituted new statutory exemptions. These have lessened the burden imposed on industry by renegotiation and, more important, have concentrated renegotiation in the areas where it is most needed.

I strongly urge that the Congress take action as promptly as possible so that both Government and business will know that this important adjunct to speedy and effective defense contracting will remain available, at least until December 31, 1956.

DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER.
THE WHITE HOUSE, March 4, 1955.

Mr. DWORSHAK. Mr. President, I have just heard with profound interest the President's message which urges the extension of the Renegotiation Act for a 2-year period.

On February 9, 1955, I introduced a bill to accomplish that very purpose, to extend the Renegotiation Act until December 31, 1956. The bill was referred to the Senate Committee on Finance. I have discussed this subject with the chairman of that committee. I certainly hope favorable action will be expedited.

MESSAGE FROM THE HOUSE— ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION SIGNED

A message from the House of Representatives, by Mr. Maurer, its reading clerk, announced that the Speaker had affixed his signature to the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 42) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended, and it was signed by the President pro tempore.

The message also announced that the House had passed a bill (H. R. 1573) to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, in which it requested the concurrence of the Senate.

HOUSE BILL REFERRED

The bill (H. R. 1573) to repeal section 348 of the Agricultural Adjustment Act of 1938, was read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

ENROLLED JOINT RESOLUTION PRESENTED

The Secretary of the Senate reported that on today, March 4, 1955, he presented to the President of the United States, the enrolled joint resolution (S. J. Res. 42) to amend the National Housing Act, as amended.

CORRECTION—ADDITIONAL CO- SPONSORS OF SENATE JOINT RES- OLUTION 38

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I ask to have the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of February 4, 1955, corrected on page 1134, so as to include the names of the Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPEL], the Senator from Florida [Mr. SMATHERS], the Senator from Alabama [Mr. SPARKMAN], the Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS], and the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], as cosponsors of Senate Joint Resolution 38, consenting to an interstate compact to conserve oil and gas.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, the RECORD will be corrected as requested by the Senator from Illinois.

COMMITTEE MEETING DURING SEN- ATE SESSIONS

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, at the request of the chairman of the Committee on Banking and Currency, the distinguished Senator from Arkansas [Mr. FULBRIGHT], I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on Banking and Currency may sit during the next 2 weeks while the Senate is in session, to conduct hearings in respect to the stock exchanges of the United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY DR. HOR- ACE KING, MEMBER OF THE PAR- LIAMENT OF GREAT BRITAIN

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I am very pleased to have as my guest today Dr. Horace King, a member of the British Parliament from the Southampton district, and a member of the British Labor Party. Under the rules of the Senate, as a member of a national legislative body, Dr. King is entitled to the privileges of the floor. I am very happy to have him present, and I am sure the Members of the Senate will be delighted to meet Dr. King individually. [Applause, Senators rising.]

VISIT TO THE SENATE BY HON. RICHARD WOOD, A MEMBER OF THE PARLIAMENT OF GREAT BRITAIN

Mr. MONRONEY subsequently said: Mr. President, it is a distinct honor to be permitted to introduce to the Members of the Senate a very distinguished visitor from England. He is distinguished in his own right and as being the son of a very distinguished gentleman, Lord Halifax, who, during a visit to some 40 States of the Union, called on disabled veterans in various hospitals and did much to bring them hope and cheer. Thus we had, in effect, two ambassadors from England, instead of only one. It is a great pleasure and honor to introduce the Honorable Richard Wood, a member of the Parliament of Great Britain. [Applause, Senators rising.]

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. We are delighted to welcome to the Senate this distinguished visitor from the British Parliament.

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I wish to join in the remarks of the distinguished President pro tempore and also those of the Senator from Oklahoma in welcoming to the Senate Chamber this distinguished member of the British Parliament, the second one present today. I think it is quite fitting and appropriate that we have present a representative of the British Conservative Party, who has just been introduced, since earlier I had the pleasure of introducing a member of the British Labor Party, both of whom are distinguished representatives of their constituencies and of their country. I hope that as the years go by more representatives of both of those great parties may be able to visit this country and that perhaps more of our people may visit England, so that in the years ahead there may be brought about an even better understanding and closer relationship between the two great nations.

PRINTING OF MEMORIAL AD- DRESSES ON THE LATE SENATOR MAYBANK

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, on last Wednesday, during the memorial services held for Senator Maybank, our late departed colleague, numerous eulogies were handed to me by Members of the Senate, and unanimous consent was obtained to place them in the RECORD. It was my intention at that time to make a request, at the instance of other Members of the Senate, including the President pro tempore, to the effect that other Members who could not be present on the floor that afternoon would have several days in which to submit for the RECORD remarks or statements on the life, character, and public services of the late Senator Maybank.

I now ask unanimous consent that such remarks or statements may be submitted and that they may be printed in the permanent RECORD as of Wednesday last, following the other eulogies delivered on that day.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

LIMITATION OF DEBATE DURING MORNING HOUR

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, under the rule, there will be a morning hour for the presentation of petitions and memorials, the introduction of bills, and other routine matters, and I ask unanimous consent that any statements made in connection therewith be limited to 2 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Without objection, it is so ordered.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore laid before the Senate the following letters, which were referred as indicated:

EXTENSION OF PERIOD FOR EMERGENCY ASSISTANCE TO CERTAIN FARMERS AND STOCKMEN

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend the act of April 6, 1949, to extend the period for emergency assistance to farmers and stockmen (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

PROMOTION OF AGRICULTURAL DEVELOPMENT PROGRAM

A letter from the Acting Secretary of Agriculture, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to promote an agricultural development program under title III of the Bankhead-Jones Farm Tenant Act, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

REPORT OF OFFICERS ON DUTY WITH DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY AND ARMY GENERAL STAFF

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report of the number of officers on duty with the Department of the Army and Army General Staff on December 31, 1954 (with accompanying reports); to the Committee on Armed Services.

REPORT ON BORROWING AUTHORITY, OFFICE OF DEFENSE MOBILIZATION

A letter from the Director, Office of Defense Mobilization, Executive Office of the President, transmitting, pursuant to law, a report on Borrowing Authority, for the quarter ended September 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT OF INTERNAL REVENUE CODE RELATING TO DISCRIMINATION AGAINST CERTAIN MEMBERS OF ARMED FORCES

A letter from the Acting Secretary of the Navy, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to amend section 37 of the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 so as to remove a discrimination against retired members of the Armed Forces of the United States (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Finance.

AUDIT REPORT ON BUREAU OF NARCOTICS, TREASURY DEPARTMENT

A letter from the Assistant Comptroller General of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, an audit report on the Bureau of Narcotics, Treasury Department, for the fiscal year ended June 30, 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL PROPERTY AND ADMINISTRATIVE SERVICES ACT OF 1949, AS AMENDED, RELATING TO SURPLUS PROPERTY

A letter from the Administrator, Federal Civil Defense Administration, Battle Creek, Mich., transmitting a draft of proposed legis-

lation to amend further the Federal Property and Administrative Services Act of 1949, as amended, to authorize the disposal of surplus property for civil defense purposes (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT ON DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE FOREIGN EXCESS PERSONAL PROPERTY DISPOSAL

A letter from the Director, Legislative Liaison, Department of the Air Force, transmitting, pursuant to law, the annual report of the Department of the Air Force covering the disposal of Air Force excess personal property located in areas outside the continental United States, Alaska, Hawaii, Puerto Rico, and the Virgin Islands, for the calendar year 1954 (with an accompanying report); to the Committee on Government Operations.

REPORT OF MONEYS RECEIVED AND EXPENDED UNDER OUTER CONTINENTAL SHELF LANDS ACT

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, reporting, pursuant to law, the amounts of all moneys received and expended in connection with the administration of the Outer Continental Shelf Lands Act of August 7, 1953, for the period August 7, 1953, to July 1, 1954; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AUTHORIZATION OF MORTGAGES AND DEEDS OF TRUST ON CERTAIN INDIAN OR RESTRICTED LANDS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the execution of mortgages and deeds of trust on individual Indian trust or restricted land (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AUTHORIZATION FOR TERRITORY OF ALASKA TO INCUR INDEBTEDNESS

A letter from the Assistant Secretary of the Interior, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the Territory of Alaska to incur indebtedness, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

AMENDMENT OF COMMUNICATIONS ACT OF 1934, RELATING TO AUTHORITY OVER CERTAIN COMMON CARRIERS

A letter from the Chairman, Federal Communications Commission, Washington, D. C., transmitting a copy of proposed legislation to amend sections 212, 219 (a), 221 (a), and 410 (a) of the Communications Acts of 1934, as amended, submitted by the Federal Communications Commission (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

THEODORE J. HARRIS

A letter from the Postmaster General, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation for the relief of Theodore J. Harris (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

GRANTING OF APPLICATIONS FOR PERMANENT RESIDENCE TO CERTAIN ALIENS

Two letters from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders granting the applications for permanent residence filed by certain aliens, together with a detailed statement of the facts and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien, and the reasons for granting the applications (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

SUSPENSION OF DEPORTATION OF CERTAIN ALIENS

A letter from the Commissioner, Immigration and Naturalization Service, Department of Justice, transmitting, pursuant to law, copies of orders suspending deportation, together with a detailed statement of the facts

and pertinent provisions of law as to each alien and the reasons for ordering such suspension (with accompanying papers); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

AUTHORIZATION FOR FURNISHING SUBSISTENCE AND QUARTERS TO CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF CORPS OF ENGINEERS

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to authorize the furnishing of subsistence and quarters without charge to employees of the Corps of Engineers engaged on floating plant operations (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

DISPOSAL OF FEDERALLY OWNED PROPERTY AT OBSOLESCENT CANALIZED WATERWAYS

A letter from the Secretary of the Army, transmitting a draft of proposed legislation to provide for the disposal of federally owned property at obsolescent canalized waterways, and for other purposes (with an accompanying paper); to the Committee on Public Works.

DISPOSITION OF EXECUTIVE PAPERS

A letter from the Archivist of the United States, transmitting, pursuant to law, a list of papers and documents on the files of the Selective Service System, which are not needed in the conduct of business and have no permanent value or historical interest, and requesting action looking to their disposition (with accompanying papers); to a Joint Select Committee on the Disposition of Papers in the Executive Departments.

PETITIONS AND MEMORIALS

Petitions, etc., were laid before the Senate, or presented, and referred as indicated:

By the PRESIDENT pro tempore:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Appropriations:

"House Joint Memorial 10

"To the President of the United States; the Congress of the United States; Director of Defense Mobilization; Secretary of Defense; Secretary of the Interior; the Governor of Alaska; the Delegate to Congress from Alaska; the Bureau of Public Roads; and the Alaska Road Commission, Juneau, Alaska:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in 22d session assembled, respectfully represents that:

"Whereas the connection by road of Unalakleet and Kaltag, Alaska, is important to the defense of Alaska and the development of river commerce on the Yukon River; and

"Whereas such road would approach the Keteel River area in which approximately 500,000 acres of land are under oil leases; and

"Whereas the distance from St. Michael to Kaltag, the usual shipping route, by river is approximately 500 miles; and

"Whereas the distance from Unalakleet to Kaltag by proposed road is approximately only 90 miles; and

"Whereas navigation from Kaltag up the Yukon River as far as Galena is open at least 30 days before navigation of the same river is open from St. Michael to Kaltag; and

"Whereas the proposed site for said road is a natural roadbed conducive to easy construction; and

"Whereas the construction of said proposed road would make it possible to get supplies into Galena by a much shorter route than that now followed in shipping down river from Nenana.

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, respectfully urges the President of the United States, the Congress of the United States, Director of Defense Mobilization, Secretary of Defense, Secretary of the Interior, the

Governor of Alaska, the Delegate to Congress from Alaska, the Bureau of Public Roads, and the Alaska Road Commission, Juneau, Alaska, to appropriate sufficient funds to construct this proposed road between Unalakleet and Kaltag, Alaska, in the construction year of 1956.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the house February 15, 1955.

"WENDELL P. KAY,

"Speaker of the House.

"Attest:

"JOHN T. McLAUGHLIN,

"Chief Clerk of the House.

"Passed by the senate February 21, 1955.

"JAMES NOLAN,

"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"KATHERINE T. ALEXANDER,

"Secretary of the Senate."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska; to the Committee on Finance:

"House Joint Memorial 6

"To the Honorable DWIGHT D. EISENHOWER, PRESIDENT OF THE UNITED STATES; TO THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE AND THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES; TO THE HONORABLE DOUGLAS MCKAY, SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR; AND TO THE HONORABLE FELIX WORMSER, ASSISTANT SECRETARY OF THE INTERIOR:

"Your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska, in 22d regular session assembled, respectfully submits that:

"Whereas domestic deposits of many vital metals and minerals are not nearing exhaustion; and

"Whereas heavy taxation has depressed the mining industry to the point where the chance of making a fair return on a new mining investment has all but disappeared:

"Now, therefore, your memorialist, the Legislature of the Territory of Alaska respectfully urges that to encourage and promote active search for, and exploitation of, domestic mineral resources, the Congress of the United States legislate into effect a tax incentive program, applicable to all States, Territories and possessions, embodying the following principles:

"1. Exemption from income tax liability of a newly launched mining enterprise for a period of 3 years after the property has begun commercial operations;

"2. Removal of the existing limitations on deductibility of exploration expenditures;

"3. Deductions for percentage depletion should not be denied a taxpayer either in a year of loss or the year against which the loss is applicable;

"4. Depletion should be allowed to stockholders owning stock in a corporation that derives 75 percent or more of its profits directly from the operation of mines; and

"5. A mining taxpayer should be allowed to write off up to 25 percent of his depreciable capital annually.

"And your memorialist will ever pray.

"Passed by the house February 4, 1955.

"WENDELL P. KAY,

"Speaker of the House.

"Attest:

"JOHN T. McLAUGHLIN,

"Chief Clerk of the House.

"Passed by the senate February 21, 1955.

"JAMES NOLAN,

"President of the Senate.

"Attest:

"KATHERINE T. ALEXANDER,

"Secretary of the Senate."

Petitions of Joseph M. Lynch, and sundry citizens of the State of New York, praying for the enactment of the Bricker amendment to the Constitution, relating to the treaty-making power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Republican Women's Federation of San Diego County,

Calif., favoring the enactment of the Bricker amendment to the Constitution, relating to the treaty-making power; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

A resolution adopted by the Redlands (California) Real Estate Board, favoring the enactment of legislation to establish the San Bernardino FHA office for the processing of loan applications; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

A resolution adopted by the Western States Conference of the International Union of Operating Engineers, A. F. of L., relating to the use of Federal gasoline taxes for the reconstruction of the national interstate system of highways; to the Committee on Public Works.

ACREAGE ALLOTMENTS FOR SPRING WHEAT—CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF NORTH DAKOTA LEGISLATURE

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, on behalf of myself and my colleague, the junior Senator from North Dakota [Mr. YOUNG], I present, for appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota relating to the unwarranted, unfair discrimination in acreage allotments for spring wheat.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, under the rule, will be printed in the RECORD.

The concurrent resolution was referred to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, as follows:

Senate Concurrent Resolution 5

Concurrent resolution memorializing Congress, the President, and the Secretary of Agriculture to take appropriate steps to correct unwarranted and unfair discrimination in respect to acreage allotments for hard spring wheat farmers in North Dakota

Whereas there has never been and there is not now a surplus or oversupply of hard spring wheat; and

Whereas the allotment of hard spring wheat acreage throughout the State of North Dakota is so low in many instances that many farmers cannot operate their farms successfully and produce sufficient agricultural products and livestock to provide a livelihood for themselves and their families; and

Whereas there is unquestionably an unfair discrimination against the small hard spring wheat farmers in North Dakota as compared with soft wheat farmers in other States: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota (the House of Representatives concurring therein), That Congress, the President of the United States, and the Secretary of Agriculture are hereby urged and requested to take all necessary and appropriate steps to establish a minimum of 100 acres for each hard spring wheat grower in the State of North Dakota, as well as in such other States as may be producing hard spring wheat and which are now faced with the hardship resulting from such unfair discrimination; be it further

Resolved, That the secretary of state is hereby directed to forward properly authenticated copies of this resolution to the President of the United States, to the Presiding Officers of the United States Senate and House of Representatives, to the Secretary of Agriculture, and to each of the Senators and Representatives of the State of North Dakota in Congress.

Mr. YOUNG. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent that I may make a

statement of not to exceed 1 minute in support of the resolution adopted by the Legislative Assembly of North Dakota, and presented by my senior colleague [Mr. LANGER].

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there objection? The Chair hears none, and the junior Senator from North Dakota may proceed.

Mr. YOUNG. The resolution very properly calls attention to the fact that the United States today does not have a surplus of high quality hard spring wheat. The spring wheat farmers of America have constantly strived to produce the very best-quality wheat. They have refrained from the temptation to produce low-quality wheats which are a much higher producer. To a large extent many of our low yields, and sometimes our crop failures because of rust, are due to the fact that our farmers have planted only top-quality wheat. This is not true of many other wheat-producing areas of the United States.

We do not believe our farmers should be penalized, as they are now, because they have continued to produce top quality but lower producing wheats.

By Mr. LANGER (for himself and Mr. YOUNG):

A resolution of the Senate of the Legislature of the State of North Dakota; to the Committee on Public Works:

"Senate Resolution 6

"Resolution to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; to the Congress of the United States; to the Honorable Sinclair Weeks, Secretary of the Department of Commerce; to the Honorable Charles E. Wilson, Secretary of Defense; to the Honorable C. D. Curtiss, Chief of Administration for the Bureau of Public Roads; to the Honorable Milton R. Young and the Honorable William Langer, United States Senators from the State of North Dakota; to the Honorable Otto Krueger and the Honorable Usher L. Burdick, Congressmen from the State of North Dakota; requesting a reallocation and increased strategic mileage in the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944 to add United States Highway No. 2 to the National Interstate highway system

"Whereas the Federal Aid Highway Act of 1944, which act amended the Federal Road Act, approved July 11, 1916, as amended and supplemented, provided that 'There shall be designated in the continental United States a national system of interstate highways not exceeding 40,000 miles in extent, so located as to connect by routes as direct as practicable the principal metropolitan areas, cities, and industrial centers, to serve the national defense and to connect at suitable border points with routes of continental importance in the Dominion of Canada and the Republic of Mexico;' and

"Whereas the act further provided that 'The routes of the national system of interstate highways shall be selected by joint action of the highway departments of the several States and the adjoining States,' and in another provision required approval by the Federal Works Administrator; and

"Whereas Phillip B. Fleming, major general, United States Army, Administrator of the Federal Works Agencies, caused to be entered a certificate of approval of the national system of interstate highways, dated the second day of August 1947, which adopted a national system of interstate highways, selected by the joint action of the State highway departments of each State and adjoining States, and

"Whereas the national system of interstate highways selected, modified, and revised, as aforesaid, is comprised of routes totaling approximately 37,800 miles in extent; and

"Whereas there is a balance of 2,200 miles within the 40,000-mile limit provided for in the Federal Aid Act of 1944 which can be placed on the interstate system; and

"Whereas United States Highway No. 2 is the shortest route through arterial highway link between Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., and Seattle, Wash., and runs parallel to the northern border of the United States and intercepts all highway communications with Canada in the State of North Dakota, as well as the several other boundary States; and

"Whereas said United States Highway No. 2 plays an ever increasing integral and necessary role in the tremendous development of the country's natural resources, namely, oil, coal, gas, iron ore, nuclear, and other minerals, as well as the vast timber industry, and in the vast development of power being generated by the dams constructed and being constructed in the Northwest, and in the expanding industrial development potential in the several States and in Canada, notably in the Provinces of Manitoba and Alberta, all of which demands a revision and an increase in our vital defense needs; and

"Whereas the said United States Highway No. 2, which can without any difficulty be linked from east coast to west coast through the States of New York, Vermont, New Hampshire, and Maine, and connected with Canada's Highway No. 9 from New York to Montreal and Highway No. 17 from Montreal to Sault Ste. Marie, which are of importance in Dominion of Canada, is the only connection between our air defense bases, the number of which and the personnel involved are known only to Congress, and Department of Defense officials, along the entire northern defense perimeter of the continental United States; and

"Whereas, under the hourly maximum traffic classifications, the interstate designation of the United States Highway No. 2 to be determined by the Bureau of Public Roads, can be the classification of interstate rural, under the specification for the interstate system set out by the Bureau, this could call for a two-lane highway with a 100-foot right-of-way, and

"Whereas the total mileage involved in this petition is approximately 2,178 miles in length and connects at points in seven States from the City of Sault Ste. Marie, Mich., to the city of Everett, Wash., and

"Whereas, while this is a petition from the State of North Dakota, it is contemplated the joining by the several other States with similar petitions, action having already been started in the States of Montana, Idaho, and Washington, this is especially true in view of the gigantic growth and expansion of the areas served by, contiguous to and adjacent to United States Highway No. 2, because such areas, at their accelerated progress, resulting from a shift of population and industry to the Northwestern States, and increasing industrial expansion in all areas, demand a revision of the transportation needs; and

"Whereas this request that the designation of the United States Highway No. 2 be placed on the national system of interstate highways is made without prejudice to existing interstate highways in the State of North Dakota, and in the other States served by the United States Highway No. 2: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Senate of the State of North Dakota, that the senate does hereby, most earnestly and respectfully, request that the Congress of the United States recognize the strategic importance of United States Highway No. 2, and through the proper Federal agencies take immediate action to have United States Highway No. 2 designated an integral part of the national system of defense highways, and that it be placed on the

national system of interstate highways; be it further

"Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted by the Honorable Norman Brunnsdale, Governor of the State of North Dakota, and by the Honorable Ben Meier, secretary of state of North Dakota, to the Honorable Dwight D. Eisenhower, President of the United States; to the Congress of the United States; to the Honorable Sinclair Weeks, Secretary of the Department of Commerce; to the Honorable Charles E. Wilson, Secretary of Defense; to the Honorable C. D. Curtiss, Chief of Administration for the Bureau of Public Roads; to the Honorable Milton R. Young and the Honorable William Langer, United States Senators from North Dakota; and to the Honorable Otto Krueger and the Honorable Usher L. Burdick, Congressmen from North Dakota.

"C. P. DAHL,

"President of the Senate.

"EDWARD LENO,

"Secretary of the Senate."

By Mr. SALTONSTALL (for himself and Mr. KENNEDY):

A resolution of the House of Representatives of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Resolution memorializing the Congress of the United States to take action to admit Alaska and Hawaii to statehood

"Whereas the matter of the admission to statehood of Alaska and Hawaii has been under consideration for a long time; and

"Whereas both Alaska and Hawaii by the democratic processes prevailing therein and the actions of their people, have shown that they are entitled to become states of the United States of America; Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the Massachusetts House of Representatives respectfully urges the Congress of the United States to take such action as may be necessary to admit both Alaska and Hawaii to statehood; and be it further

"Resolved, That copies of these resolutions be transmitted forthwith by the State secretary to the President of the United States, to the presiding officer of each branch of Congress and to each Member thereof from this Commonwealth."

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

"Senate Joint Memorial 1

"Joint memorial by the 22d Legislature of the State of New Mexico memorializing the Congress of the United States of America to provide adequate sources of farm credit to agricultural enterprises in New Mexico, particularly those stricken by the drought and other disasters

"Whereas drought and disaster have created in many areas in New Mexico a critical financial condition for farmers and businessmen; and

"Whereas sound and adequate credit facilities are urgently needed to preserve the economy of many sections of the State and to prevent needless suffering on the part of those family enterprises hardest hit by drought and other disaster: Now, therefore, be it

"Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the Congress of the United States be, and it hereby is, memorialized to enact new legislation and broaden existing legislation that will authorize or provide for the following:

"1. Extension of the authority and time limit for making emergency loans beyond the present 2-year period which expires in July 1955;

"2. Orderly liquidation of the above emergency loans over periods up to 10 years;

"3. A relatively low interest rate on such emergency loans;

"4. A loan program set up through the Farmers' Home Administration to enable farmers and ranchers to consolidate all of their financial obligations, excluding real estate mortgages, but including provision for interest on real estate loans and for taxes;

"5. A provision allowing the borrower, where necessary, to make reasonable land payments from sale of farm products;

"6. Additional farm-mortgage credit comparable to the former Land Bank Commissioner loans in such disaster and drought areas;

"7. Streamlining of Farmers' Home Administration loan procedures, including removal of regulations requiring personal financial responsibility of Farmers' Home Administration personnel except where fraud or gross negligence is clearly indicated;

"8. Broadening and extension of the feed and livestock use provisions of the emergency feed-relief program so that this program will be better adapted and more workable in each area, to include a provision that necessary precautions be taken to see that the feed is used for the purpose for which it was intended; be it further

"Resolved, That certified copies of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and to each Member of the New Mexico delegation in Congress.

"JOE M. MONTAÑA,

"President, Senate.

"EDWARD G. ROMERO,

"Chief Clerk, Senate.

"DONALD D. HALLAM,

"Speaker, House of Representatives.

"FLOYD CROSS,

"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.

"Approved by me this 18th day of February 1955.

"JOHN F. SIMMS,

"Governor, State of New Mexico."

Two joint resolutions of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Finance:

"Senate Joint Memorial 5

"Joint memorial memorializing the Representatives and Senators of the State of New Mexico in the Congress of the United States to support and undertake legislation limiting the importation of foreign petroleum

"Whereas to the best information available to the legislature of this State the following considerations pertaining to the petroleum industry should be held paramount in any public policy concerning the industry:

"Item I. There exists no reasonable and economic means of stockpiling petroleum for the national defense; therefore, large proven and developed reserves must be maintained through the investment of vast amounts of labor and capital and through the continuous application and development of new methods of discovery and recovery of petroleum reserves.

"Item II. The United States Department of Interior has urged that the petroleum industry maintain a production capacity far above the Nation's average daily production.

"Item III. In the interest of conservation of petroleum as a basic natural resource it is essential that the depletion of any pool or area be done in a methodical and orderly manner to conserve the resource and to attract new capital.

"Item IV. Most of the Nation's petroleum producing States have joined in creating and maintaining a voluntary and effective means of regulating production to serve the ends of national security and the conservation of this highly essential resource by providing a venturesome but, for the aggregate

of investors, a sound investment opportunity, and by providing for the Nation a rapidly growing quantity of proven reserves and highly productive capacity; and

"Whereas national policy now permits the importation of foreign crude petroleum or refined products at a rate which jeopardizes the continued development of domestic sources and production facilities and so endangers the Nation's defense as well as the economic welfare of New Mexico and her sister petroleum producing States; and

"Whereas New Mexico and her sister oil-producing States are contributing to and becoming essential parts of a great industrial complex founded largely upon petroleum as an economic and easily transported source of energy; and

"Whereas the continued growth and well-being of these States and the Nation depend upon the continuing development of petroleum resources: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the Congress of the United States be, and hereby is, urged to act at the earliest opportunity to restrict the present excessive rates of imports of oil to a level which will prevent injury to the national security and the general economy and welfare of the Nation; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this joint memorial be transmitted to Members of this State's delegation in Congress.

"JOE M. MONTOYA,
"President, Senate.
"EDWARD G. ROMERO,
"Chief Clerk, Senate.

"DONALD D. HALLAM,
"Speaker, House of Representatives.
"FLOYD CROSS,

"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.
"Approved by me this 18th day of February 1955.

"JOHN F. SIMMS,
"Governor, State of New Mexico."

"Senate Joint Resolution 10

"Joint resolution to the United States Treasury Department regarding the sale of foreign and imported potash in the United States at less than fair market value

"Whereas the United States Treasury Department has reportedly ascertained that potash is being imported from foreign sources and sold in the United States at less than fair market value; and

"Whereas such action appears to be in violation of the Federal antidumping laws; and

"Whereas such action tends to damage the American potash industry, and particularly the potash industry of the State of New Mexico; and

"Whereas the potash industry is of vital concern to the economy of the State of New Mexico and its citizens: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the United States Treasury Department be urged to take necessary action to investigate and enforce compliance with the letter and spirit of the antidumping laws of the Federal Government insofar as such laws pertain to potash and the potash industry; be it further

Resolved, That copies of this resolution be transmitted to the Secretary of the Treasury of the United States, and to each Member of the United States Senate and the United States House of Representatives from the State of New Mexico, and the United States Tariff Commission.

"JOE M. MONTOYA,
"President, Senate.
"EDWARD G. ROMERO,
"Chief Clerk, Senate.

"DONALD D. HALLAM,
"Speaker, House of Representatives.
"FLOYD CROSS,

"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.
"Approved by me this 18th day of February 1955.

"JOHN F. SIMMS,
"Governor, State of New Mexico."

A joint resolution of the Legislature of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Joint Memorial 3

"Joint memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to enact legislation granting 2 million acres of land in trust to this State for the purpose of providing public school buildings

"Be it resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico:

"Whereas the United States Government and the agencies thereof own over 40 percent of the total land in the State of New Mexico; and

"Whereas such land is not subject to taxation by the State and results in a hardship to the people of this State in raising sufficient revenue for the support of public schools; and

"Whereas a grant of 2 million acres in trust to the State for public school buildings would greatly alleviate such hardship; and

"Whereas such a trust would be of permanent and enduring benefit and would provide a more stable support for the public schools than appropriations by Congress for such purposes: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the Congress of the United States be and it hereby is memorialized to enact legislation granting 2 million acres of land in this State in trust to the State for public school buildings and providing that only the income from such trust may be expended for such school buildings; and be it further

Resolved, That a duly enrolled and engrossed copy of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and to each Member of the New Mexico delegation in Congress.

"JOE M. MONTOYA,
"President, Senate.
"EDWARD G. ROMERO,
"Chief Clerk, Senate.

"DONALD D. HALLAM,
"Speaker, House of Representatives.
"FLOYD CROSS,

"Chief Clerk, House of Representatives.
"Approved by me this 18th day of February 1955.

"JOHN F. SIMMS,
"Governor, State of New Mexico."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs:

"Senate Memorial 4

"Memorial memorializing the Senate and House of Representatives of Congress of the United States to pass Senate bill No. 500 to authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project

"Whereas there is a pressing need for the most beneficial use of natural resources in the United States of America; and

"Whereas the citizens of New Mexico are especially interested in, and dependent upon the natural resources represented by life-giving waters of our rivers and streams; and

"Whereas Senate bill No. 500, now before the Congress of the United States, would, in the considered opinion of the people of New Mexico, and the 22d legislature of the State of New Mexico authorize an extremely vital project: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the Congress of the United States be urged to give their earnest consideration to, and pass Senate bill No. 500, which would authorize the Secretary of the Interior to construct, operate, and maintain the Colorado River storage project; be it further

Resolved, That certified copies of this memorial be transmitted to both Houses of

Congress, to the chairman of the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, and to Senators CLINTON P. ANDERSON and DENNIS CHAVEZ.

"JOE M. MONTOYA,
"President of the Senate.
"EDWARD G. ROMERO,
"Chief Clerk of the Senate.

"Approved by me this 8th day of February 1955.

"JOHN F. SIMMS,
"Governor, State of New Mexico."

A resolution of the Senate of the State of New Mexico; to the Committee on the Judiciary:

"Senate Memorial 6

"Memorial memorializing the Congress of the United States to prohibit the issuance of Federal liquor licenses in counties of States having exercised local option prohibiting sale of intoxicants within its boundaries

"Whereas certain counties in New Mexico have elected by the local option process to prohibit the sale of intoxicants in their boundaries; and

"Whereas certain individuals obtain Federal liquor licenses and distribute liquor in violation of the local laws, a condition has developed which tends to contribute to juvenile delinquency. Lack of adequate police supervision in remote rural areas encourages youths to purchase alcoholic beverages from federally licensed persons and in violation of the New Mexico law; and

"Whereas the problem of law enforcement in counties of large area and small population is materially increased it is felt the denial of Federal liquor licenses in local option dry counties will reduce violation of local laws: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Legislature of the State of New Mexico, That the Congress of the United States be and is hereby respectfully urged to enact legislation prohibiting the issuance of Federal liquor licenses in counties of the State of New Mexico which have by local option process elected to prohibit the sale of alcoholic beverages; and be it further

Resolved, That the enrolled and engrossed copies of this memorial be transmitted to the President of the Senate and the Speaker of the House of Representatives of the Congress of the United States and to each Senator and Representative in Congress from New Mexico.

"JOE M. MONTOYA,
"President of the Senate.
"EDWARD G. ROMERO,
"Chief Clerk of the Senate.

"Approved by me this 18th day of February 1955.

"JOHN F. SIMMS,
"Governor, State of New Mexico."

LETTER AND CONCURRENT RESOLUTION OF INDIANA LEGISLATURE

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from William C. Brummett, principal clerk of the Indiana State House of Representatives and the enclosed copy of the House Concurrent Resolution 9, of the Indiana Legislature, relating to the investigation of corrupt operations of the Federal Housing Administration.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The letter and resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, will be printed in the RECORD.

The letter and resolution were referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency, as follows:

STATE OF INDIANA,
Indianapolis, February 24, 1955.
Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.

DEAR SENATOR CAPEHART: The House Concurrent Resolution 9 commending the Senate Banking and Currency Committee of the United States Senate and you for your efforts in investigating the corrupt operations of the Federal Housing Administration is enclosed.

We are indeed proud to know that our own Senator is doing such fine work in the Senate.

Very truly yours,
WILLIAM C. BRUMMETT,
Clerk.

House Concurrent Resolution 9

Concurrent resolution commending the Senate Banking and Currency Committee of the United States Senate and Senator HOMER E. CAPEHART for their efforts in investigating the corrupt operations of the Federal Housing Administration

Whereas shocking proof of wholesale misuse of the people's money under the loose or corrupt operation of the Federal Housing Administration has been revealed by the coast-to-coast investigation by the Banking and Currency Committee of the United States Senate; and

Whereas these revelations are resulting in the correction of the laws and regulations which permitted this multi-million-dollar abuse to grow into a scandalous racket; Therefore be it

Resolved by the House of Representatives of the General Assembly of the State of Indiana (the Senate concurring):

SECTION 1. The members of the 89th General Assembly of the State of Indiana do hereby extend congratulations to the Banking and Currency Committee of the United States Senate for what it has done, and they especially commend the Honorable HOMER E. CAPEHART for his tireless and thorough work as the chairman of that committee and for his fearless exposure of the Federal Housing Administration mess.

RESOLUTION OF GUAM LEGISLATURE

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a letter from Maria C. Duenas, Executive Secretary of the Third Guam Legislature, Territory of Guam, together with Resolution No. 25, adopted by the Guam Legislature, relating to the special housing finance fund for Guam.

There being no objection, the letter and resolution were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THIRD GUAM LEGISLATURE,
Territory of Guam,
Agana, Guam, February 14, 1955.

Hon. HOMER CAPEHART,
House of Senate,
United States Congress,
Washington, D. C.

SIR: As directed, I am enclosing a certified copy of Resolution No. 25, relative to expressing the appreciation of the people of Guam to the Honorable HOMER CAPEHART, Senator from the State of Indiana, for his cooperation and his conscientious consideration and representations leading to the provision of a \$15 million special housing finance fund for Guam, duly and regularly

adopted by the Guam Legislature on January 19, 1955.

Very truly yours,
MARIA C. DUENAS,
Executive Secretary.

Resolution 25

Resolution relative to expressing the appreciation of the people of Guam to the Honorable HOMER CAPEHART, Senator from the State of Indiana, for his cooperation and his conscientious consideration and representations leading to the provision of a \$15 million special housing finance fund for Guam

Be it resolved by the Legislature of the Territory of Guam:

Whereas the Honorable HOMER CAPEHART, Senator from the State of Indiana and members of the staff of the distinguished Senator did cooperate fully and were instrumental in assisting the people of Guam to obtain a special assistance \$15 million housing fund for the rehabilitation of this Territory: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved, That the Third Guam Legislature does hereby express on behalf of the people of Guam their deep and sincere appreciation to the Honorable Senator HOMER CAPEHART from Indiana for his sympathetic understanding of the housing problems of Guam and his constructive and effective aid in helping to partially solve the same through special assistance financing; and be it further

Resolved, That the executive secretary be and she hereby is directed to transmit copies of this resolution to the Honorable HOMER CAPEHART, Senator from the State of Indiana, and to the Governor of Guam.

F. B. LEON GUERRERO,
Speaker.
A. S. N. DUENAS,
Legislative Secretary.

RESOLUTIONS OF ASSOCIATION OF AMERICAN PHYSICIANS & SUR- GEONS, INC., CHICAGO, ILL.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I present for appropriate reference, and ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, resolutions adopted by the delegates of the Association of American Physicians & Surgeons, at their meeting in Chicago, Ill., on October 2, 1954, relating to the treatymaking power, and tax-exempt foundations.

There being no objection, the resolutions were received, appropriately referred, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

To the Committee on the Judiciary:

"RESOLUTION ON THE NEW BRICKER AMENDMENT

"Whereas the Association of American Physicians & Surgeons, in regular session assembled in the past, have adopted resolutions favoring passage of Senator BRICKER's amendment which would limit future treaty commitments to such areas as (1) those which would not abridge individual freedom, and (2) those which would not be unconstitutional if passed as domestic law; and

"Whereas a new Congress (the 84th) will convene on January 5, 1955, and many Members of it will not be cognizant of the association's previous actions; and

"Whereas Senator BRICKER has declared his intentions of introducing his new amendment (S. J. Res. 181 of the 83d Cong.) on the 1st day of the 84th Congress, January 5, 1955: Therefore be it

Resolved, That we, the members of the Association of American Physicians & Sur-

geons, in regular session assembled this 2d day of October 1954, do hereby reaffirm our support of Senator BRICKER's Senate Joint Resolution 181 (83d Cong.), or equivalent legislation to be introduced; be it further *Resolved*, That a copy of this resolution be spread upon the minutes of this meeting and that copies be sent to (1) the President of the United States, (2) all Members of Congress, and (3) all State and county medical societies."

To the Committee on Finance:

"RESOLUTION ON TAX-EXEMPT FOUNDATIONS
"Whereas the Reece subcommittee of the 83d Congress to investigate the activities of tax-exempt foundations is a temporary committee; and

"Whereas the Reece subcommittee was unable to complete its work and ceased to exist with the end of the session of the 83d Congress; and

"Whereas its preliminary investigations have revealed the urgent necessity of further investigation of the activities of the tax-exempt foundations: Therefore be it

Resolved, That the Association of American Physicians & Surgeons commend the Reece subcommittee for its work and petition the House of Representatives of the United States Congress to extend the life of this subcommittee with power and resources to complete its probe of the tax-exempt foundations."

TRANSFER OF NARCOTICS BU- REAU—RESOLUTION OF AMERI- CAN PHARMACEUTICAL MANU- FACTURERS' ASSOCIATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, as my colleagues know, I have long been deeply interested in doing everything possible to combat and destroy the dreadful narcotics menace in our Nation.

I have cosponsored legislation to battle against this grim problem and will continue to do so until dope addiction is slashed to the irreducible minimum in our land.

But we must always exercise sound judgment in evaluating actions which are proposed to meet this problem, particularly because narcotics are an indispensable arm of medical science wholly aside from the fact that narcotics are unfortunately misused in illicit channels.

I was interested recently to receive from Dr. J. O'Neil Closs, executive vice president of the American Pharmaceutical Manufacturers' Association, a message rightly conveying the judgment of that association in opposition to the proposed transfer of the Narcotics Bureau from the Treasury Department to the Department of Justice.

The narcotics laws of our country are inextricably related to the administration of selected tax laws. The logical place of the Narcotics Bureau remains within the Treasury Department. Merely shuffling a Bureau which has been doing an outstanding job—shuffling it from one department to another is no answer to the narcotics challenge, as such. What is needed is better understanding of legitimate and illegitimate uses of narcotics, allocation of more agents for the Narcotics Bureau, more effective enforcement at State and local levels, tighter penalties and firmer rehabilitation of addicts.

I ask unanimous consent that the resolution be printed in the RECORD, and be

referred to the Senate Finance Committee.

There being no objection, the resolution was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

AMERICAN PHARMACEUTICAL
MANUFACTURERS' ASSOCIATION,
New York, N. Y., February 18, 1955.

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY,
United States Senate, Senate Office
Building, Washington, D. C.

DEAR SIR: The board of directors of the American Pharmaceutical Manufacturers' Association has given thoughtful consideration to the proposal for transfer of narcotic control from the Treasury Department to the Department of Justice, as provided by Senate Joint Resolution 19. Because such transfer appears to be against the public interest at this time, our board has passed the following resolution opposing it, and it urges that Senate Joint Resolution 19 be not adopted:

"Whereas governmental supervision of narcotic problems involves not only questions of criminal enforcement but also national and international social problems of addiction, and regulation of the affected drug and pharmaceutical industries; and

"Whereas the sound and effective execution of governmental narcotic control will be disturbed and impaired detrimentally to the public and to industry by its transfer to a different agency not presently organized to deal with the narcotic problem as a whole: Therefore be it

"Resolved, That the American Pharmaceutical Manufacturers' Association opposes the transfer of narcotic control from the Bureau of Narcotics of the Treasury Department to the Department of Justice."

Sincerely,

J. O'NEILL CLOSS,
Executive Vice President.

UNEMPLOYMENT IN CARPET INDUSTRY—MEMORIAL

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, a fortnight ago I received from the chamber of commerce of Amsterdam, N. Y., a petition signed by over 16,000 citizens of Amsterdam protesting against any further cuts in tariff as applied to carpets and rugs.

Mr. President, there is a tragic condition of unemployment in Amsterdam. It is a truly distressed area. One of the largest carpet manufacturers in America has closed its plants in Amsterdam and is moving elsewhere. There are, however, other carpet mills in Amsterdam. It is one of the great carpet-manufacturing centers of this country. The workers in the carpet mills, their families, and all the citizens of Amsterdam are deeply concerned over the impact of possible tariff reductions on their industries. I am concerned, likewise, although I have always been in favor of the greatest possible expansion of trade consistent with our national interest.

Without committing myself on proposed legislation that will come before us on this subject, I think that these petitions are of sufficient importance—representing the viewpoint of a large number of people in my State—that note of them should be made in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

I ask unanimous consent that one of these petitions be printed in the RECORD at this point. I shall transmit the remaining petitions to the Senate Finance

Committee, which is considering this proposed legislation.

There being no objection, the petition was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

We, the undersigned workers and residents of the city of Amsterdam, N. Y., and immediate vicinity, who are preponderantly dependent on our local manufacturers of machine-made rugs and carpets (Mohawk Carpet Mills, Inc., and Bigelow-Sanford Carpet Co., Inc.), do hereby respectfully petition United States Senators HERBERT H. LEHMAN and IRVING M. IVES, and Representative in Congress from the 32d Congressional District BERNARD W. KEARNEY, to exert every effort to prevent any Federal legislation which would further reduce tariff rates on machine-made rugs and carpets.

Foreign, cheap-wage machine-made carpets are coming into the United States at the rate of 2,800,000 square yards a year.

For every yard of carpet imported, 1 hour's work is lost to an American workman.

Foreign imports meant loss in 1954 of 2,800,000 man-hours of work, or an average of almost 3 weeks' work for each of the 30,000 United States carpet workers. Lost wages of American workers curtailed purchasing power which affects all segments of the community.

Since 1946 annual rate of growth of imports of machine-made carpets and rugs has averaged 26 percent per year.

Average wage for industrial workers in Belgium, 48 cents an hour; in Britain, 47 cents; in France, 46 cents; and in Japan, 19 cents.

It is against such wage levels that many American industries—including carpets—are being forced to compete.

The carpet industry firmly believes in, and makes a considerable contribution to, world trade. The industry is a vital part of our economy and contributes to world trade through \$100 million a year in imports of raw materials, which is a very large proportion for a \$400 million a year industry. All wools used in carpets are imported.

The city of Amsterdam, N. Y., is now classified as a critical labor area. The reduction of tariff rates on machine-made rugs and carpets will further increase unemployment, and such reduction will in all probability destroy our only industry in the city of Amsterdam, N. Y.

We petition that, in any trade-agreements act that may be passed, such legislation contain a provision excluding machine-made carpets and rugs from further tariff reduction.

(Signatures omitted).

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES

The following reports of committees were submitted:

By Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 804. A bill to amend section 201 (e) of the Career Compensation Act of 1949, as amended, to provide for advance payments of certain pay and allowances of members of the uniformed services, and for other purposes; without amendment (Rept. No. 45).

By Mr. STENNIS, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 802. A bill to amend the Universal Military Training and Service Act, as amended, to remove the requirement for a final physical examination for inductees who continue on active duty in another status in the Armed Forces; without amendment (Rept. No. 46).

By Mr. SALTONSTALL, from the Committee on Armed Services:

S. 829. A bill to authorize personnel of the Armed Forces to train for, attend, and participate in the second pan-American games, the seventh Olympic winter games, games

of the XVI Olympiad, future pan-American games, and Olympic games, and certain other international amateur sports competitions, and for other purposes; with amendments (Rept. No. 44).

By Mr. ANDERSON, from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry:

S. 72. A bill to provide that certain lands acquired by the United States shall be administered by the Secretary of Agriculture as national-forest lands; without amendment (Rept. No. 43).

EXPENDITURES BY COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES—REPORT OF A COMMITTEE

Mr. RUSSELL, from the Committee on Armed Services, reported an original resolution (S. Res. 72) which was placed on the calendar, as follows:

Resolved, That in carrying out the duties imposed upon it by section 136 and authorized by section 134 (a) of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946, as amended, the Committee on Armed Services, or any duly authorized subcommittee thereof, is authorized during the period from April 1, 1955, ending January 31, 1956, to make such expenditures, and to employ upon a temporary basis such investigators, technical, clerical, and other assistants as it deems advisable.

Sec. 2. The expenses of the committee under this resolution, which shall not exceed \$160,000, shall be paid from the contingent fund of the Senate upon vouchers approved by the chairman of the committee.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON ARMED SERVICES

Mr. SALTONSTALL, Mr. President, as in executive session, from the Committee on Armed Services, I report, favorably, the nomination of Chester R. Davis, of Illinois, to be Assistant Secretary of the Army, vice Charles C. Finucane, who has been appointed Under Secretary of the Army. I ask that the nomination be placed on the Executive Calendar.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The nomination will be placed on the Executive Calendar.

EXECUTIVE REPORT OF COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

Mr. GEORGE, as in executive session, from the Committee on Foreign Relations, to which was referred Executive R, 83d Congress, 1st session, the International Telecommunication Convention, with annexes, and the final protocol to the Convention, signed at Buenos Aires on December 22, 1952, reported it favorably, with two understandings, and submitted a report (Ex. Rept. No. 5) thereon.

BILLS AND JOINT RESOLUTION INTRODUCED

Bills and a joint resolution were introduced, read the first time, and, by unanimous consent, the second time, and referred as follows:

By Mr. NEELY (by request):

S. 1289. A bill to establish a family court in and for the District of Columbia; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. CHAVEZ:

S. 1290. A bill to provide for the construction of certain Government buildings in the District of Columbia; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ROBERTSON:

S.1291. A bill for the relief of Ioannis Gerasimos Christoforatos (otherwise known as Ioannis Gerasimu Christoforatos or John Christoforatos or Jon Christoforatos); to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. CARLSON):

S.1292. A bill to readjust postal classification on educational and cultural materials; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

(See the remarks of Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

S.1293. A bill relative to the payment of salaries to recess appointees;

S.1294. A bill for the relief of James William Turner;

S.1295. A bill for the relief of Vera Ivanovich; and

S.1296. A bill for the relief of Maria Anna Coone; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. KEFAUVER (for himself and Mr. CHAVEZ):

S.1297. A bill to amend title 18, United States Code, so as to regulate the transportation and shipment of fireworks; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. BUSH:

S.1298. A bill for the relief of Pericles G. Callimanopoulos and his family; and

S.1299. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Estenl Rodriguez Estopinan de Witlicki; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S.1300. A bill to declare a certain portion of the waterway at Greenwich, Conn. (in which is located the Greenwich Harbor), a nonnavigable stream; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

(See the remarks of Mr. BUSH when he introduced the last above-mentioned bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. DIRKSEN:

S.1301. A bill to limit the acquisition and use by agencies of the Federal Government of equipment for reproducing documents, drawings, papers, and so forth, on sensitized materials; to the Committee on Government Operations.

By Mr. KILGORE:

S.1302. A bill to amend section 490 of title 14, United States Code, relating to the settlement of claims of military and civilian personnel of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes;

S.1303. A bill to amend section 4004, title 18, United States Code, relating to administering oaths and taking acknowledgments by officials of Federal penal and correctional institutions;

S.1304. A bill to provide for the relief of certain Army and Air Force nurses, and for other purposes.

S.1305. A bill to further amend the act of July 3, 1943 (ch. 189, 57 Stat. 372), relating to the settlement of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death caused by military personnel or certain civilian employees of the United States, by removing certain limitations on the payment of such claims and the time within which such claims may be filed; and

S.1306. A bill for the relief of Robert Burns DeWitt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. KILGORE when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself, Mr. IVES, Mr. PURTELL, Mr. BENDER, and Mr. ALLOTT):

S.1307. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended, to provide increased benefits in case of disabling injuries, and for other purposes; and

S.1308. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act to authorize more effective use of the special fund provided for in section 44; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. (See the remarks of Mr. SMITH of New Jersey when he introduced the above bills, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL):

S.1309. A bill to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, approved September 7, 1916, as amended, by providing for reimbursement of expenditures from the Employees' Compensation Fund by Federal employing agencies, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare. (See the remarks of Mr. SMITH of New Jersey when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GEORGE (by request):

S.1310. A bill to amend the International Claims Settlement Act of 1949, as amended, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Relations.

By Mr. ERVIN (for himself, Mr. HOLLAND, and Mr. MARTIN of Pennsylvania):

S.1311. A bill to authorize the incorporation of Army and Navy Legion of Valor of United States of America; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MARTIN of Iowa:

S.1312. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Santina Reichardt; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. LANGER:

S.1313. A bill to increase the insurance protection of depositors in federally insured banks from \$10,000 to \$20,000; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

(See the remarks of Mr. LANGER when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. CAPEHART:

S.1314. A bill for the relief of Reuben Nichols and Andrew Nichols; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. McNAMARA):

S.1315. A bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. ELLENDER (by request):

S.1316. A bill to amend subsection 216 (c), part II, of the Interstate Commerce Act to require the establishment by motor carriers of reasonable through routes and joint rates, charges, and classifications; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. KNOWLAND:

S.1317. A bill for the relief of Yao Chung Hsuan; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MONRONEY (for himself and Mr. KERR):

S.1318. A bill to authorize construction of a highway crossing over Lake Texoma, Red River, Tex. and Okla.; to the Committee on Public Works.

By Mr. ALLOTT (for himself, Mr. ANDERSON, Mr. BARRETT, Mr. CARLSON, Mr. CHAVEZ, Mr. KERR, Mr. MILLIKIN, Mr. MONRONEY, Mr. O'MAHONEY, and Mr. SCHOEPEL):

S.1319. A bill to make available unexpended balances of funds heretofore appropriated for the agricultural-conservation program for wind-erosion control measures, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Appropriations.

(See the remarks of Mr. ALLOTT when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. GREEN:

S.1320. A bill for the relief of Peter N. Vondoras; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

S.1321. A bill creating a Federal commission to formulate plans for the construction in the District of Columbia of a civic auditorium, including an Inaugural Hall of Presidents, and a music, drama, fine arts, and mass communications center; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. HILL:

S.1322. A bill for the relief of Maria Ioannou Karvelis and her three minor daughters, Martha Karvelis, Boeleta Karvelis, and Euterpi Karvelis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HILL (for himself, Mr. THYE, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. DUFF, Mr. KENNEDY, Mr. MURRAY, Mr. NEELY, Mr. LEHMAN, Mr. McNAMARA, Mr. HUMPHREY, Mr. KEFAUVER, Mr. LANGER, and Mr. JACKSON):

S.1323. A bill to authorize a 5-year program of grants for construction of medical educational and research facilities; to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

(See the remarks of Mr. HILL when he introduced the above bill, which appear under a separate heading.)

By Mr. PURTELL:

S.1324. A bill for the relief of Salvatore di Morello; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HUMPHREY:

S. J. Res. 53. Joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the direct popular election of President and Vice President; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

(See the remarks of Mr. HUMPHREY when he introduced the above joint resolution, which appear under a separate heading.)

READJUSTMENT OF THE POSTAL CLASSIFICATION OF EDUCATIONAL AND CULTURAL MATERIALS

Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, and the Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to readjust the postal classification of certain educational and cultural materials. I ask unanimous consent that the bill, together with a statement prepared by me, explaining the purposes of the bill, be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1292) to readjust postal classification on educational and cultural materials, introduced by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina (for himself and Mr. CARLSON), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That sections 204 (d) and (e) of the Postal Rate Revision and Federal Employees Salary Act of 1948 (39 U. S. C., sec. 292a (d) and (e)), are amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 204. (d) The following materials when in parcels not exceeding 70 pounds in weight may be sent at the postage rate of 8 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof and 4 cents for each additional pound or fraction thereof, and this rate shall continue until otherwise provided by the Congress: (1) Books permanently bound for preservation consisting wholly of reading matter or scholarly bibliography or reading matter with incidental blank spaces for students' notations and containing no advertising matter other than incidental announcements

of books; (2) 16-millimeter films and 16-millimeter film catalogs except when sent to commercial theaters; (3) printed music whether in bound form or in sheet form; (4) printed objective test materials and accessories thereto used by or in behalf of educational institutions in the testing of ability, aptitude, achievement, interests, and other mental and personal qualities with or without answers, test scores, or identifying information recorded thereon in writing or by mark; (5) manuscripts for books, periodical articles, and music.

"SEC. 204. (e) (1) The following materials when in parcels not exceeding 70 pounds in weight when loaned or exchanged between (A) schools, colleges, universities, or public libraries and (B) religious, educational, scientific, philanthropic, agricultural, labor, veterans', or fraternal organizations or associations not organized for profit and none of the net income of which inures to the benefit of any private stockholder or individual, or between such organizations and their members or readers or borrowers, shall be charged with postage at the rate of 4 cents for the first pound or fraction thereof and 1 cent for each additional pound or fraction thereof, and this rate shall continue until otherwise provided by the Congress; (a) Books consisting wholly of reading matter or scholarly bibliography or reading matter with incidental blank spaces for students' notations and containing no advertising matter other than incidental announcements of books; (b) printed music whether in bound form or in sheet form; (c) bound volumes of academic theses in typewritten or other duplicated form and bound volumes of periodicals; and (d) other library materials in printed, duplicated, or photographic form or in the form of unpublished manuscripts.

"(2) The rate provided in paragraph (1) for books may apply to 16-millimeter films, filmstrips, projected transparencies and slides, microfilms, sound recordings, and catalogs of such materials when sent in parcels not exceeding 70 pounds in weight to or from (A) schools, colleges, universities, or public libraries, and (B) religious, educational, scientific, philanthropic, agricultural, labor, veterans', or fraternal organizations or associations, not organized for profit and none of the net income of which inures to the benefit of any private stockholder or individual."

SEC. 2. It is the sense of the Congress that every reasonable encouragement should be given as a matter of Government policy to the export through private commercial and eleemosynary channels of American publications and literary, artistic, and scholarly works and therefore the United States Government should take advantage of the optional provision of the Universal Postal Convention of 1952 to reduce by 50 percent the regular printed matter rate in the international mails for newspapers, periodicals, books, pamphlets, music, and maps as other leading countries of the world have done.

The statement presented by Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR JOHNSTON OF SOUTH CAROLINA

This bill is designed to correct the principal anomalies and inequalities in the classifications governing postal rates applicable to educational and cultural materials. It has long been national policy to encourage the dissemination of such materials through the postal system; but in the many years since the matter of mail classifications has been considered as such, a number of relatively small but important types of material have been overlooked.

This is a particularly appropriate time to make these adjustments. Our educational

institutions and libraries are struggling with the problems of maintaining educational and cultural standards for a vastly expanded school and college population. The continued growth of our intellectual, cultural, and artistic life is important not only for its own intrinsic value here at home but as a factor in international relations during this era of competition for the minds and spirits of men throughout the world.

I. SUMMARY OF PROVISIONS

Section 1. Domestic rates: The first provision of this section adds to the materials eligible for the general rate on books and educational films the following additional items: (1) scholarly bibliography; (2) sheet music; (3) educational tests; and (4) authors' manuscripts. The second provision of this section removes the geographical limit on the library rate on books and educational films and makes the following additional items eligible for this rate: (1) scholarly bibliography; (2) sheet music; (3) bound academic theses and bound periodicals; and (4) other library materials including manuscripts.

Section 2. International rates: This section is an expression of congressional opinion that the United States should encourage the international exchange of American educational, cultural, and artistic materials by adopting the optional reduction in international postal rates for books, newspapers, periodicals, music, and maps authorized by the Universal Postal Convention, as many other leading countries of the world have done.

II. DETAILS OF THE BILL

Application of general book rate to additional materials

There has existed since 1938 a separate rate for books which is not zoned for distance. This rate is patterned on the nationwide rate for reading matter in newspapers and magazines (second-class mail) which dates from 1879. The objective in both cases has been to facilitate the dissemination of educational and cultural materials and not to penalize the citizens, the libraries and the educational institutions more remote from publishing centers with higher rates merely because of the accident of geography. In 1953 the book rate was also extended to educational films by Public Law 141, 83d Congress.

This general rate for books and educational films now stands at 8 cents for the first pound and 4 cents for each succeeding pound, and this bill suggests no change in this rate, which is still twice as high as the 1.95 cents per pound rate now applicable to the reading matter in general second-class publications. The bill merely permits this rate to apply to the following four additional small categories of educational and cultural materials:

Scholarly bibliography: By scholarly bibliography is meant lists of books and articles, frequently annotated, in a particular field sponsored or published by a professional society or other disinterested group for the guidance of scholars, students, librarians, professional practitioners and others interested in the field. At present such works are not admitted to the book rate if the name of the publisher and the price are listed, the Post Office Department having ruled that this makes the bibliography an advertising catalog. Thus works such as Winchell's Guide to Reference Books of the American Library Association, which is a critical guide for librarians on the encyclopedias and reference works of most use for particular purposes, is ruled to be a catalog and therefore not eligible for the book rate. These bibliographic guides are essential tools of the librarian, scholar, educator, and researcher, and are fully as deserving of favorable treatment as the periodicals and books

to which they refer. Catalogs of individual publishers are not covered.

Sheet music: Printed music in sheet form is now severely penalized as compared with music in bound form in the domestic mails, and music in any form in the international mails. Printed music in bound form, such as songbooks and hymnals, qualifies for the book rate within the United States and is not zoned for distance; but the same music in sheet form is classed as parcel post if over 8 ounces, with considerably higher rates and rates increasing with distance. In the international mails, on the other hand, music qualifies for the favorable printed matter rate along with books, magazines, newspapers, and maps. By far the greatest volume of sheet music—some 84 percent—which is sold in the United States today is standard music, that is, religious, classical, or semiclassical. Only 16 percent of all music sold at retail consists of current popular songs. The bulk of this standard music is sold to public and private schools and colleges, to churches, and to private teachers of music: 88 percent of the music sold by dealers and 94 percent of the music sold directly to the ultimate consumer by publishers goes to these classes of consumers. The customary practice in the trade is that the consumer pays the postage. Almost half of the music sold by dealers is forwarded by mail to their customers and practically all of the music sold directly to the consumers goes through the postal system. The bill provides that sheet music shall qualify for the general book rate as bound music now does.

Educational tests: With the progress of education have come certain valuable new educational materials that have taken an important place alongside books: namely, films, pupil workbooks, and objective tests. The place of films and workbooks in the postal rate structure has been recognized by the Congress: these instructional materials may now be shipped to educational institutions under the same postal classification as books. This bill accords printed tests used by or in behalf of educational institutions the same treatment.

Use of tests is now one of the indispensable procedures in the improvement of teaching and guidance and in the discovery of talent. A significant aspect of a student's education today is measurement and appraisal of his status, development, and aptitudes by means of such tests. This procedure is to be encouraged, for tests contribute to the school's understanding of the student and his own understanding of himself, and thus to educational and vocational guidance to enable him to make the full use of his potentialities.

The bill provides that these test materials that are employed by or in behalf of educational institutions to determine abilities, aptitudes, achievement, interests, and other mental or personal qualities of their pupils be classified for shipment at the general book rate. This includes both (1) new test booklets and answer sheets and (2) those that have been marked by pupils.

1. The shipment of new or unmarked test material from the publisher or distributor to educational institutions: If the major premise is accepted that postal rates should apply equally to all forms of educational communication, then it seems clear that tests should be accorded the book rate. Tests and their associated materials (e. g. answer sheets, scoring keys, directions) seem to have been inadvertently excluded from the current book classification in part because of the arbitrary definition that a book must contain 24 pages. Transportation costs are borne by the educational institutions and this now imposes a special hardship under zoned parcel post rates for schools remote from the publishing centers for these materials.

2. The shipment to and from central scoring and research agencies for test materials with pupils' answers, scores, or identifying information recorded thereon: Many schools and colleges have come to rely heavily on cooperative educational testing programs that may be statewide, regional, or national in scope. The scoring or marking of the tests and the statistical analysis of test scores is frequently done by a central agency, usually on a nonprofit basis, with the results reported to the participating schools. Thus, the teachers and guidance personnel in the schools are relieved of the heavy clerical burden of marking tests, and the work is done faster and more accurately than it could be done at the school.

According to an interpretation of the present postal statutes by the Solicitor of the Post Office Department, test booklets or answer sheets on which pupils have indicated the answers they believe to be correct are technically classified as letters and must be transported by first-class mail. Shipment by parcel post or by means of private transportation agencies, such as Railway Express, would thus be in violation of the law because of the Federal Government's monopoly on first-class mail.

The operation of the present postal law seriously retards the development of cooperative testing programs involving central scoring and statistical service. Hence, it has a restrictive effect upon the obtaining and use of objective data in the improvement of the instruction and guidance of individual boys and girls. Funds available for testing are small in numerous schools and, under present financial conditions, it seems unlikely that they can be increased. The cost of transportation of marked test material to a test service center may now, in many situations, actually be greater than the service costs. Many schools must either refrain from participation in testing programs or require their teachers to use time in scoring tests that ought to be devoted to more important professional activities. This kind of use of teacher time for clerical purposes is particularly unfortunate at present when the teacher shortage is very acute.

High postage costs deter schools from obtaining for their pupils the full benefits of objective measurement, and especially is this true in districts that have low financial resources. It is the schools themselves that must pay the transportation costs; and the schools particularly in need of objective test data oftentimes are the ones least able to pay those costs. The provision of the bill to permit the shipment of test materials at the book postal rate will benefit children and youth at all educational levels throughout the United States.

Authors' manuscripts: Authors' manuscripts for books, periodical articles and music are now required to be sent by first-class mail unless they accompany corrected printers' proof sheets, in which case they may be sent as third- or fourth-class. This is a burden on authors and composers, who pay postage charges both ways in submitting manuscripts to publishers, and especially on authors of books and long serious works of music. Book manuscripts frequently weigh from 4 to 10 pounds and an average figure would be about 6 pounds, or \$2.88 in first class postage. Thus the submission of a manuscript of 6 pounds to 10 publishers before acceptance would cost \$54.72. Express is often somewhat cheaper but even express involves high minimum charges. In the 19th century our domestic postal rates gave more consideration to authorship—manuscripts were then not classified as first-class mail. Nor at the present time is the burden of letter rates imposed in the international mails governed by the Universal Postal Convention, under which manuscripts may be sent at the favorable commercial paper rate. An American author can now submit a book

manuscript to a British publisher in London for about one-third the postage charges required to send the same manuscript to a publisher in the United States. It is one of the anomalies in our domestic postal classifications that the original form of literature and music and the original creator are penalized as compared with the more favorable rates granted on the manuscript in proof form or in final printed form, or even in its original form in the international mails.

Application of the library-book rate to additional materials

The special library rate dating from 1928 is 4 cents for the first pound and 1 cent for each succeeding pound on books exchanged in interlibrary loans, or in loans by libraries to their readers, within the first three postal zones or within the limits of any one State. In 1953 the Congress extended this rate to educational films and other audio-visual materials in Public Law 141, 83d Congress.

This bill extends the library rate to several additional small categories of library materials and removes the geographical limitations and the present requirement of securing permits. No change is proposed in the level of the rate itself.

Scholarly bibliography and sheet music: The bill adds scholarly bibliography and sheet music to the materials eligible for the library-book rate, consistent with their coverage by the general book rate in the preceding section.

Academic theses and bound volumes of periodicals: Institutions of higher learning at one time frequently required that academic theses submitted for higher degrees be published in printed form, but with the growth in higher education this requirement became impractical and most such theses are now typewritten, but in bound form. There is a considerable volume of interlibrary loans of academic theses as a service to researchers, to scholars, and to students preparing other theses. Despite the fact that this traffic is almost entirely between libraries and especially college and university libraries, these theses are not eligible for the library book rate, and are required to carry first-class postage because they are in typewritten form. This is a considerable burden on scholars and students who must reimburse the libraries for the postage required in securing the loan of these materials. It is entirely consistent with the philosophy of the library book rate, and would be a considerable benefit to higher education and scholarship, to include theses in the general rate applicable to library materials.

Bound volumes of periodicals, when exchanged between libraries or between libraries and their borrowers, are not eligible for the library book rate although these materials serve exactly the same purpose as library service on books. Library loan of bound periodicals now takes place in relatively small volume because of the development of photostating arrangements and microfilming but the application of the library book rate would contribute substantially to library service and to scholarly research.

Other library materials: In addition to books, theses, and periodicals, modern libraries make available to their readers a considerable variety of a number of other materials. One of the most important of these, educational films and other audiovisual materials, was assimilated to the library book rate in 1953. Miscellaneous other library materials should be added in order to carry out the broad purposes of this special rate for library interchange.

Removal of geographical limits and permit requirement: When the library-book rate was established in 1928, library service by mail was confined largely to readers in the local area or to interlibrary loans between institutions in the same general locality. In the years since that time regional library services for scholarly and research materials

have been established; and a nationwide network now exists for the interchange of materials needed for research. It seems appropriate, therefore, to recognize these changed conditions. There seems no reason why the library rate should be subject to a narrow geographical limitation now that the general book rate has been on a nationwide basis for some 18 years. Much the same considerations apply to the requirement of permits. No permit is necessary under the terms of Public Law 141, which extended the library-book rate to audiovisual materials in 1953. The permit system hardly seems necessary for administrative purposes since the institutions eligible for this rate are clearly identifiable by their names on the addresses or return addresses.

Educational and cultural materials in the international mails

The Universal Postal Convention, which was last revised at Brussels in 1952, permits national postal authorities to reduce the rates charged for books, magazines, newspapers, music, and maps to 50 percent of the required rates for other printed matter in order to encourage the international exchange of educational and cultural materials. This optional provision has now been adopted in its entirety by the following countries: Austria, Western Germany, Greece, Italy, Luxembourg, the Netherlands, Portugal, Spain, Switzerland, Turkey, the United Kingdom, and Venezuela, plus several other countries which restrict the 50-percent reduction to books alone or to other more limited classes of materials. The United States has not yet taken similar action and the result has been to place American materials of this type at an economic disadvantage in competing with the publications of other countries. For example, a book weighing 2 pounds may be sent from London or Frankfurt to Pakistan, Japan, or the Philippines for about 10 cents in postage, whereas to send a book of the same weight from New York requires 25 cents in postage, or 2½ times as much. American-published materials, although much in demand, are already under a severe handicap of foreign-exchange restrictions limiting dollar imports in many countries as compared with similar materials from soft-currency countries; and this differential on transportation charges, which are paid by the purchaser, further adds to the competitive disadvantage of American materials. In view of the governmental efforts being made through the United States overseas information program and the technical-assistance program to encourage the use of American educational, cultural, technical, and scientific materials abroad in the national interest, it would be sound public policy to eliminate the existing differential in postal rates which handicaps distribution through private commercial and eleemosynary channels. The cost to the United States in reduced postal revenue would be small as compared with the cost of achieving similar results by direct governmental expenditures.

III. ORGANIZATIONS SUPPORTING THE BILL

The following is a partial list of organizations endorsing and supporting the bill or one or more of its several provisions: American Academy of Teachers of Singing; American Educational Research Association; American Guild of Organists; American Library Association; American String Teachers Association; American Textbook Publishers Institute; Association of College and Reference Libraries; Association of Research Libraries; Authors' League; Church and Sunday School Music Publishers Association; College Entrance Examination Board; Committee on Diagnostic Reading Tests; Committee on Reading Development, American Book Publishers Council; Educational Records Bureau; League of Composers; Music Educators National Conference; Music Library Association; Music Publishers Asso-

ciation; Music Teachers National Association; National Association of Educational Broadcasters; National Association of Teachers of Singing; National Audio-Visual Association, Postal Committee; National Catholic Music Educators Association; National Council on Measurements Used in Education; National Federation of Music Clubs; National Guild of Piano Teachers; Sigma Alpha Iota; State Testing Leaders Conference; the American Accordionists Association.

Mr. CARLSON subsequently said: I am glad to join in the sponsorship of the bill—S. 1292—dealing with postal classifications on certain educational and cultural materials, especially as they affect our educational institutions and public libraries. As a result of a special study of the educational use of the mails which was made last year for the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, a number of situations have come to light which should be adjusted. Congress has always recognized the vital importance of the postal system as an instrument of education in the broadest sense; and the bill will serve to bring certain details of postal classification into line with established congressional policy.

DESIGNATION OF WATERWAY AT GREENWICH, CONN., AS A NON-NAVIGABLE STREAM

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to declare a certain portion of the waterway at Greenwich, Conn., a nonnavigable stream.

This proposed legislation is needed because the layout of the Greenwich-Killingly Expressway crosses over a portion of the marshland and a portion of the dredged basin, both of which are within the officially established limits of Greenwich Harbor. I have introduced the bill at the request of the Connecticut State Highway Department.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1300) to declare a certain portion of the waterway at Greenwich, Conn. (in which is located the Greenwich Harbor), a nonnavigable stream, introduced by Mr. BUSH, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

SUNDRY BILLS FOR CONSIDERATION OF JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

Mr. KILGORE. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, five bills which have been submitted by the Department of the Treasury, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Air Force, and by the Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice.

I ask unanimous consent that there be printed in the RECORD to accompany each of these bills the letters forwarded with these proposals by the Department of the Treasury, the Department of the Army, the Department of the Air Force, and by the Bureau of Prisons, Department of Justice, recommending the enactment of such legislation.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately

referred; and, without objection, the letters will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills, introduced by Mr. KILGORE, were received, read twice by their titles, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, as follows:

S. 1302. A bill to amend section 490 of title 14, United States Code, relating to the settlement of claims of military and civilian personnel of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 1302 is as follows:)

TREASURY DEPARTMENT,
Washington, January 10, 1955.

THE PRESIDENT OF THE SENATE.

SIR: There is transmitted herewith a draft of a proposed bill "To amend section 490 of title 14, United States Code, relating to the settlement of claims of military and civilian personnel of the Coast Guard, and for other purposes."

The purpose of this proposed legislation is to give the Secretary of the Treasury the same authority to settle claims of Coast Guard military and civilian personnel as is now held by the Secretaries of the Military Departments with respect to similar claims in their departments.

Section 490 of title 14 was based on the provisions of the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945 (59 Stat. 225), which had been applicable to the Coast Guard prior to the enactment of title 14 into positive law. Subsequent to the enactment of title 14, the Military Personnel Claims Act of 1945 was amended by act of Congress approved July 3, 1952 (66 Stat. 321).

By adding a new subsection to section 490, the proposed legislation would authorize the Secretary of the Treasury to settle claims made by survivors of personnel whether or not the incident giving rise to the claim occurred simultaneously with or subsequent to the death of such personnel. This authority is now held by the Secretaries of the Military Departments under the act of July 3, 1952. Moreover, the proposed legislation would change the time allowed for filing claims from 1 year to 2 years, which is the time limit now applicable to the other services. Finally, the proposal would suspend for 1 year all time limitations on filing of such claims to allow for the consideration of new claims arising under section 490, as amended, and for the reconsideration of claims previously disapproved as not having been filed within the legal time. This provision is similar to that included in the similar amendatory legislation of the armed services.

It would be appreciated if you would lay the proposed bill before the Senate. A similar proposed bill has been transmitted to the Speaker of the House of Representatives.

The Department has been advised by the Bureau of the Budget that there is no objection to the submission of this proposed legislation to the Congress.

Very truly yours,

H. CHAPMAN ROSE,
Acting Secretary of the Treasury.

COMPARATIVE TYPE SHOWING CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW MADE BY PROPOSED BILL

Changes in existing law made by the proposed bill are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in brackets; new matters in italics):

"SECTION 490 OF TITLE 14 OF THE UNITED STATES CODE

"(a) The Secretary, and such other officer as he designates for such purposes and under regulations prescribed by him, may consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, settle, and pay any claim against the United States, including claims not heretofore satisfied arising on or after December 7, 1939, of military personnel and civilian employees of the Coast

Guard, when such claim is substantiated, and the property determined to be reasonable, useful, necessary, or proper under the attendant circumstances, in such manner as the Secretary may by regulations prescribe, for damage to or loss, destruction, capture, or abandonment of personal property occurring incident to their service, or to replace such personal property in kind, if the damage to or loss, destruction, capture, or abandonment of property shall not have been caused in whole or in part by any negligence or wrongful act on the part of the claimant, his agent, or employee, and shall not have occurred at quarters occupied by the claimant within the continental United States, excluding Alaska, which are not assigned to him or otherwise provided in kind by the Government.

"(b) In the event of the death of any person among the military personnel or civilian employees enumerated in subsection (a), the Secretary is hereby authorized to consider, ascertain, adjust, determine, settle and pay any claim, otherwise cognizable under this section, presented by the survivor of such person for damage to or loss, destruction, capture, or abandonment of the personal property of such person, regardless of whether such damage, loss, destruction, capture, or abandonment occurred concurrently with or subsequent to such death. For the purposes of this section, the term 'survivor' means surviving spouse, child or children, parent or parents, or brothers or sisters or both, of the decedent, and claims by survivors shall be settled and paid in that order of precedence.

"[b] (c) No claim shall be settled under this section unless presented in writing within [one year] two years after the accident or incident out of which such claim arises shall have occurred; if such accident or incident occurs in time of war [] or in time of armed conflict in which the Armed Forces of the United States are engaged, or if war or such armed conflict intervenes within [one year] two years after its occurrence, any claim may, on good cause shown, be presented within [one year] two years after [termination of the war] such good cause ceases to exist, but not later than two years after peace is established or such armed conflict terminates. The dates of commencement and termination of an armed conflict for the purpose of this subsection shall be as established by concurrent resolution of the Congress or by determination of the President.

"[c] (d) Any such settlement made by the Secretary, or his designee, under the authority of this section and such regulations as he may prescribe hereunder, shall be final and conclusive for all purposes, notwithstanding any other provision of law to the contrary.

"[d] (e) Such appropriations as may be required for the settlement of claims under the provisions of this section are authorized. Coast Guard appropriations shall be available for the settlement of claims by the Secretary or his designee under the provisions of this section."

S. 1303. A bill to amend section 4004, title 18, United States Code, relating to administering oaths and taking acknowledgments by officials of Federal penal and correctional institutions.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 1303 is as follows:)

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT
OF JUSTICE,
Washington, February 14, 1955.

HON. HARLEY M. KILGORE,
United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR SENATOR: I am enclosing draft of a bill together with a memorandum of explanation, which would authorize the Attorney General to designate additional officers and employees of our Federal penal

and correctional institutions, as the need may be, who would have authority to administer oaths and take acknowledgments of officers, employees, and inmates without charge. If you feel that this proposed amendment has merit, I would appreciate it very much if you would sponsor it in the Senate.

I have sent another draft of the bill and the explanatory memorandum to Congressman Celler for introduction in the House, if he feels that the proposed amendment has merit.

While this proposed bill has not been made a part of the formal departmental-legislative program, I am sure that the Department will be glad to support it.

Yours very truly,

JAMES V. BENNETT,
Director.

S. 1304. A bill to provide for the relief of certain Army and Air Force nurses, and for other purposes.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 1304 is as follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, January 3, 1955.

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation, to provide for the relief of certain Army and Air Force nurses, and for other purposes.

This proposal is part of the Department of Defense Legislative Program for 1955 and the Bureau of the Budget has advised that there is no objection to the presentation of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of the Air Force has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

Under the provisions of section 208b of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947 (Public Law 36, 80th Cong.) as interpreted by the Comptroller General of the United States (pp. 242-244, vol. 28, Decisions of the Comptroller General of the United States), Navy nurses are permitted to count civilian service as nurses with the United States Public Health Service as creditable service for the computation of longevity pay. However, there is no provision in the above-cited law which permits Army and Air Force nurses to count such service as that noted above as creditable service for the computation of longevity pay. This inequity was corrected in 1949 upon the enactment of the Career Compensation Act of 1949 (Public Law 351, 81st Cong.). It is deemed a matter of equity to provide legislation which would validate payments of longevity pay made to Army and Air Force nurses on the basis of civilian service as nurses with the United States Public Health Service from the effective date of enactment of the Army-Navy Nurses Act of 1947 to the day prior to the effective date of the Career Compensation Act of 1949. This proposal would allow credit in the accounts of disbursing officers for such payments and would authorize repayment of any amounts which have been collected by the United States in settlement of claims arising from such payments.

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCES

This proposal was submitted to the 83d Congress by the Department of the Army on June 24, 1954, as a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1954. It was introduced as H. R. 9740 and S. 3806. H. R. 9740 was reported to the House on July 20, 1954, Report No. 2300, and passed the House on August 3, 1954.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

Any additional cost resulting from the enactment of this proposal would be small and will be absorbed in existing appropriations.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD E. TALBOTT.

S. 1305. A bill to further amend the act of July 3, 1943 (ch. 189, 57 Stat. 372), relating to the settlement of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death caused by military personnel or certain civilian employees of the United States, by removing certain limitations on the payment of such claims and the time within which such claims may be filed. (The letter accompanying Senate bill 1305 is as follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF THE AIR FORCE,
Washington, January 3, 1955.

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation, "To further amend the act of July 3, 1943 (ch. 189, 57 Stat. 372), relating to the settlement of claims for damage to or loss or destruction of property or personal injury or death caused by military personnel or certain civilian employees of the United States, by removing certain limitations on the payment of such claims and the time within which such claims may be filed."

This proposal is part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1955 and the Bureau of the Budget has advised that there would be no objection to the presentation of this proposal for the consideration of the Congress. The Department of the Air Force has been designated as the representative of the Department of Defense for this legislation. It is recommended that this proposal be enacted by the Congress.

PURPOSE OF THE LEGISLATION

Section 1 of the act of July 3, 1943, as amended (31 U. S. C. 223b) authorizes the settlement of claims based on loss of or damage to property or personal injury or death resulting from noncombat activities of the Armed Forces. Ordinarily, there is a 1-year statute of limitations on these claims. However, if the accident or incident on which the claim is based occurs during or within 1 year before a war, the claim may, for good cause shown, be presented within 1 year after peace is established. Section 2 (c) of Public Law 450 of the 82d Congress amended the basic statute to provide that claims arising after June 23, 1950, and before the termination of the emergency proclaimed by the President on December 16, 1950, may be presented within 1 year after the termination of that national emergency or April 1, 1953, whichever is earlier. By Public Law 12, 83d Congress, the termination date was changed from April 1, 1953, to July 1, 1953, and, by Public Law 96, was changed to August 1, 1953.

This proposal would amend the basic law to provide a 2-year statute of limitations for filing claims thereunder instead of the 1 year now provided. This change would be consistent with a similar change made in the Military Personnel Claims Act by Public Law 439, 82d Congress, approved July 3, 1952, and is considered advisable in the interest of creating uniformity with respect to the statute of limitations in these claims laws.

The basic law allows an extension of the statute of limitations only if there is a war. The conflict in Korea did not constitute a war within the technical sense used in the statute. This statute is used to settle claims such as those which occur to property during maneuvers or on training grounds which may be closed to the owner until after the time for presentation of the claim has expired. It also allows settlement of claims for losses that result from parcels sent through the mails. The addressee of the parcel may suffer a loss which he does not know about

until the statute of limitations has run. Even though an armed conflict prevents claims of this nature from being presented within the period ordinarily applicable, no extension of the statute of limitations is authorized under existing law. This proposed legislation would also eliminate this inequity by extending the statute of limitations upon the occurrence of armed conflict.

Another inequity under the act of July 3, 1943, arises because, in the case of personal injury or death, the amount is limited to "reasonable medical, hospital, and burial expenses, actually incurred, * * *." No recovery is permitted for the loss of earnings, diminished earning capacity, permanent injury, pain and suffering, and death benefits. This proposal would allow settlement under the act of claims based on those reasons; however, the amount of payment would continue to be limited to \$1,000. The amendment would apply to claims accruing after the date of its enactment. The proposed amendment would eliminate many costly lawsuits, reduce the number of private reliever bills, and expedite the settlement of claims.

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCES

Two proposals containing amendments to the act of July 3, 1943, were submitted to the Congress as a part of the Department of Defense legislative program for 1953. One was introduced as H. R. 2977 and the other was introduced as H. R. 5108. Subsequently, H. R. 5108 was incorporated into H. R. 2977 and was passed by the House of Representatives. No further action was taken on that proposal. This proposal is identical with H. R. 2977, as it passed the House, except for a change in the title of the bill.

COST AND BUDGET DATA

It is estimated that the enactment of this proposal would result in an increase in cost to the Army of \$35,000 and to the Air Force of \$100,000 for fiscal year 1956; however, no worthwhile estimate of the increase in cost to the Navy or the Marine Corps is possible.

Sincerely yours,

HAROLD E. TALBOTT.

S. 1306. A bill for the relief of Robert Burns DeWitt.

(The letter accompanying Senate bill 1306 is as follows:)

DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY,
Washington, D. C., January 10, 1955.

HON. RICHARD M. NIXON,
President of the Senate.

DEAR MR. PRESIDENT: There is forwarded herewith a draft of legislation for the relief of Robert Burns DeWitt. This proposed legislation is submitted by the Department of the Army in accordance with the procedures prescribed by the Secretary of Defense.

The purpose of this proposed legislation is to provide for the payment of a claim by Mr. DeWitt, which cannot be settled administratively by the Department of the Army, but which has been determined by the Department to be meritorious and worthy of payment.

During World War I, Mr. DeWitt was county auditor of Limestone County, Tex. He was approached at Groesbeck, Tex., by one Maj. Chester H. Machin, representing the United States Army, and asked to sponsor the raising of a company of recruits for war service. Mr. DeWitt patriotically agreed after discussing the matter with Judge J. E. Bradley and Judge C. S. Bradley, both of Groesbeck, who, in turn, agreed to advance him any funds necessary. Under the terms of the informal agreement made with Major Machin, Mr. DeWitt was to bear all expenses, including transportation from the place of recruitment to Groesbeck, meals and shelter for the recruits, until a minimum of 150 men had been accepted by the Army. At that time the group was to be sent to San

Antonio, Tex., for training, and, upon acceptance of the group into the service of the United States, Mr. DeWitt was to be reimbursed for the expenses borne by him during the period of recruitment. After 156 men were so recruited, there was a delay of some 30 days before an Army representative arrived in Groesbeck, where the recruits had been collected, to inspect and accept them.

It was after a 5-month period of recruitment that these men were finally accepted into the Army and sent to San Antonio for training, where Mr. DeWitt entered the officers' training camp. During such period Mr. DeWitt had borne their expenses in accordance with his agreement with Major Machin. To secure funds for this purpose, he personally borrowed substantial sums of money from Judge J. E. Bradley and Judge C. S. Bradley. Although a number of unrecorded expenses appear to have been incurred, those known at the present time consist of the following:

Rent of building used as headquarters and sleeping quarters for 5 months at \$75 monthly.....	\$375
Hire of labor for laundry for 5 months at \$30 monthly.....	150
Installation and use of telephone for 5 months (estimated).....	125
Transportation of recruits from various towns (place of enlistment) to Groesbeck (estimated).....	150
Meals for soldiers from time of enlistment until departure for San Antonio.....	3,300
Total.....	4,100

Until his release from the service early in 1919 Mr. DeWitt repaid the Judges Bradley at the rate of \$100 per month out of his salary as a first lieutenant. Following his release, he returned to his position as county auditor and continued the \$100 monthly payments. Some time later he accepted a position with the Internal Revenue Bureau at Dallas, Tex., and before leaving Groesbeck liquidated his indebtedness to the Bradleys by selling his automobile, his equity in a house at Groesbeck, and his equity in a farm.

Following his release from the service, Mr. DeWitt requested that he be furnished the proper forms for filing his expense account and had several conferences with respect to the matter. It appears that the military authorities could not determine whether the claim should be filed with the Texas National Guard or with the United States Army, and as a result no claim was actually filed at the time, and no reimbursement was made to Mr. DeWitt. However, it appears that Mr. DeWitt's dealings at the time were, in fact, entirely with the United States Army. These men were supplied with equipment by the Army, the enlistment blanks used were furnished by the Army and two Army enlisted men assisted Mr. DeWitt in his recruiting drive. It also appears that Major Machin made speeches in the area to assist in the recruiting. The entire benefit of the money expended by Mr. DeWitt and for which he requests reimbursement in the amount of \$4,100 (or \$26.28 per man) was received by the United States Army.

The Department of the Army first became aware of this matter through a letter dated June 25, 1953, from Mr. DeWitt to the Honorable LYNDON B. JOHNSON, United States Senate, inquiring as to the possibility of recovery. A formal claim was filed in September 16, 1953. The claim cannot be considered under the provisions of the act of July 3, 1943 (57 Stat. 372), as amended (81 U. S. C. 223b), because it is not based on a tortious act or omission of military personnel or civilian employees of the Department of the Army and because the cause of action arose more than 1 year prior to submission of the

claim. Similarly, it may not be considered under the provisions of the Federal Tort Claims Act (60 Stat. 843), as codified and amended (28 U. S. C. 921-934), because it is not based on negligence and because it was submitted more than 2 years after the cause of action arose. There is no other statute available to the Department under which a claim of this nature may be processed administratively. However, Mr. DeWitt clearly made expenditures totaling at least the amount of \$4,100 for the raising of troops. His motives in doing so were patriotic, and the beneficiary of his acts was the United States Army. Under the circumstances it would be entirely inequitable to deny him reimbursement of the amount so expended. The total cost of this bill, if enacted, will be \$4,100.

The Bureau of the Budget advises that there is no objection to the submission of the proposed bill for the consideration of the Congress.

Sincerely yours,

ROBERT T. STEVENS,
Secretary of the Army.

AMENDMENT OF LONGSHOREMEN'S AND HARBOR WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], the Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], and the Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], I introduce, for appropriate reference, two bills to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act.

It will be recalled that in both his state of the Union address and his budget message President Eisenhower referred to improving the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act. These bills follow up the President's recommendations and are a part of the current legislative program of the Department of Labor.

The Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, in addition to being the workmen's compensation law which applies to longshoremen and employees of Government contractors at defense bases or on public works outside of the United States, is also the basic workmen's compensation law for the District of Columbia.

The first of these bills, Mr. President, would modernize the benefit provisions of the existing law by increasing in both injury and death cases the maximum weekly compensation limit from \$35 to \$50 a week and by increasing the minimum weekly compensation limit from \$12 to \$15 a week. Also, the period of disability required before the waiting time become compensable would be reduced from 49 to 28 days.

The second bill would improve the existing act by extending the uses of the special fund set up under section 44. This fund is derived from nondependency payment requirements and from fines and penalties. In recent years the fund has been receiving over three times as much money as has been disbursed. Among the new uses for which this money would be available are the extension of rehabilitation services and the relief of employees who have no recourse

because of the insolvency of the employer.

Mr. President, I am hopeful that there may be early and favorable action on these bills by the Labor and Public Welfare Committee. The Federal Government which constantly, and properly, urges the State to improve their workmen's compensation acts should certainly see that its own statutes on the subject keep pace with general economic and social advances.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of each bill and short explanatory statements thereof, be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bills will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bills, together with the explanations, will be printed in the RECORD.

The bills, introduced by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and other Senators), were received, read twice by their titles, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, together with the explanations thereof, as follows:

S. 1307. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended, to provide increased benefits in case of disabling injuries, and for other purposes.

Be it enacted, etc., That section 6 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended (44 Stat. 1424; 33 U. S. C. 907 et seq.), is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 6 (a) No compensation shall be allowed for the first 7 days of the disability, except the benefits provided for in section 7: *Provided, however*, That in case the injury results in disability of more than 28 days the compensation shall be allowed from the date of disability.

"(b) Compensation for disability shall not exceed \$50 per week and compensation for total disability shall not be less than \$15 per week; *Provided, however*, That if the employee's average weekly wages, as computed under section 10, are less than \$15 per week he shall receive as compensation for total disability his average weekly wages."

SEC. 2. Section 9 (e) of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended, is amended to read as follows:

"(e) In computing death benefits the average weekly wages of the deceased shall be considered to have been not more than \$75 nor less than \$22.50, but the total weekly compensation shall not exceed the weekly wages of the deceased."

SEC. 3. The provisions of this act shall be applicable only to injuries and death occurring on or after the effective date of its enactment. The amendments to section 6 and section 9 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act shall not affect the payment of any benefits heretofore adjudicated under the act of December 2, 1942, as amended (56 Stat. 1028; 42 U. S. C. 1701, et seq.) prior to the enactment of this act.

EXPLANATION OF PROVISIONS OF SENATE BILL 1307

This legislation is intended to modernize the benefit provisions of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, which have remained unchanged since 1943. This would be accomplished by increasing in both injury and death cases, the maximum weekly compensation limit from \$35 to \$50 a week and by increasing the minimum

weekly compensation limit from \$12 to \$15 a week. Also the period of disability required before the waiting time becomes compensable would be reduced from 49 to 28 days.

This proposal is intended to carry out the objective of the President expressed in his recent budget message to liberalize the benefits of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act. The proposal has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget as being in accord with the program of the President.

THE LONGSHOREMEN'S AND HARBOR WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT

The Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, which is administered by the Department of Labor, is a workmen's compensation law which applies to longshoremen and other maritime employees who are not within the jurisdiction of the States and to employees of Government contractors at defense bases or on public works outside of the United States. This act is also the basic workmen's compensation law for the District of Columbia. Further, the compensation rate under the act is the measure of compensation paid by the Federal Government under the so-called War Hazards Act for injuries arising out of war hazards to Government contractors' employees working on defense bases and on contracts outside of the United States. The total coverage of the law is estimated to be between 500,000 and 600,000 employees.

THE PRESENT BENEFIT LIMITATIONS AND AMENDMENTS PROPOSED BY THE BILL

The act specifies that benefits shall be based on 66⅔ percent of the employee's average weekly wage. This specified ratio of compensable wage loss, however, at present is subject to a maximum dollar limit of \$35 a week. When extended on an annual basis, this weekly sum aggregates only \$1,820. This benefit limit, therefore, prevents the percentage from operating in the case of wage earners whose wages exceed the dollar maximum. As the level of wages rises, the compensation which is received sinks far below the two-thirds of the employee's wage intended by the law.

Congress set the weekly compensation limits of this law in 1948 in relation to the prevailing wage rate in the industry and the prevailing cost of living at that time. Since the limit was set in 1948 on the basis of a \$52.50 weekly wage average wages earned by longshoremen for a 40-hour week have advanced substantially and, in some areas, are approximately \$90. On the basis of current earnings, therefore, the weekly maximum compensation of \$35 equals only about 40 percent of the wage loss.

It is of utmost importance that these compensation standards within Federal authority be revised in the light of changes in the economic factors which guided their establishment. The bill takes cognizance of the increases in average earnings in the employment affected and in the cost of living which have occurred since the present compensation limits were established. While a compensation limit of \$50 a week will not authorize adequate restitution in the case of injuries or death of employees with high earnings, the increased limit will cover a proportion of wage loss which is more nearly commensurate with the intended compensation ratio of 66⅔ percent of the average weekly wage for injury and death benefits which the act specifies than the present outmoded limits. The proposed increase in the minimum compensation under the act from \$12 to \$15 a week is proportionate to the increase in the maximum limitation.

CHANGE IN WAITING PERIOD

At the present time no compensation is allowed under the act for the first 7 days

of disability unless disability continues for more than 49 days. This restriction means that in the large majority of injuries sustained by employees covered by the act the employee must suffer more than a week's complete wage loss. The provision of the bill allowing payment of compensation retroactively after 28 days of disability is more in accord with the modern legislative pattern of workmen's compensation laws than the longer periods now required by the act.

RETROACTIVITY BAR

This bill also provides that the increase in benefits which would be authorized prospectively for longshoremen will not be applied retroactively to cases already adjudicated under the so-called War Hazards Act of December 2, 1942.

S. 1309. A bill to amend the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act to authorize more effective use of the special fund provided for in section 44.

Be it enacted, etc., That section 8 (g) of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as amended (44 Stat. 1424; 33 U. S. C. 901, et seq.) is amended by striking out "\$10" and inserting in lieu thereof "\$25."

SEC. 2. Section 18 of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act is amended by inserting "(a)" after "18" at the beginning of the section and by adding a new subsection (b) to read as follows:

"(b) In cases where judgment cannot be satisfied by reason of the employer's insolvency or other circumstances precluding payment, the Secretary of Labor may, in his discretion and to the extent he shall determine advisable after consideration of current commitments payable from the special fund established in section 44, make payment from such fund upon any award made under this act, and, in addition, provide any necessary medical, surgical, and other treatment required by section 7 of the act in any case of disability where there has been a default in furnishing medical treatment by reason of the insolvency of the employer. Such an employer shall be liable for payment into such fund of the amounts paid therefrom by the Secretary of Labor under this subsection; and for the purpose of enforcing this liability, the Secretary of Labor for the benefit of the fund shall be subrogated to all the rights of the person receiving such payment or benefits, including the right of lien and priority provided for by section 17 of this act, as against the employer and may by a proceeding in the name of the Secretary of Labor under section 18 or under subsection (c) of section 21 of this act, or both, seek to recover the amount of the default or so much thereof as in the judgment of the Secretary is possible, or the Secretary may settle and compromise any such claim."

SEC. 3. (a) Section 39 (c) of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act is amended by striking out "education" at the end of the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof "rehabilitation."

(b) Section 39 (c) of such act is further amended by striking out the last sentence and inserting in lieu thereof the following two sentences:

"Where necessary rehabilitation services are not available otherwise, the Secretary of Labor may, in his discretion, use the fund provided for in section 44 in such amounts as may be necessary to procure such services, including necessary prosthetic appliances or other apparatus. This fund shall also be available in such amounts as may be authorized in annual appropriations for the Department of Labor for the costs of administering this subsection."

SEC. 4. (a) Section 44 (a) of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation

Act is amended by striking out "of this act" at the end of the first sentence and inserting in lieu thereof a comma and the following: "of subsection (b) of section 18, and of subsection (c) of section 39 of this act."

(b) The second sentence of paragraph (1) of section 44 (c) of such act is amended to read as follows:

"The proceeds of this fund shall be available for payments under subsections (f) and (g) of section 8, under subsection (b) of section 18 and under subsection (c) of section 39: *Provided*, That payments authorized by subsection (f) shall have priority over other payments authorized from the fund."

EXPLANATION OF PROVISIONS OF SENATE BILL 1308

This legislation is intended to make the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, administered by the Department of Labor, more effective by extending the uses of the special fund established under section 44 of the act.

The bill authorizes the special fund to be put to additional constructive uses in areas where expenditures will produce particularly beneficial results.

This is one of the measures within the objective stated by the President in his state of the Union and budget messages to improve the provisions of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act. The proposal has been approved by the Bureau of the Budget as being in accord with the program of the President.

THE LONGSHOREMEN'S AND HARBOR WORKERS' COMPENSATION ACT

The Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act applies to longshoremen and other maritime employees who are not within the jurisdiction of the States and to employees of Government contractors at defense bases or on public works outside of the United States. This act is also the basic workmen's compensation law for the District of Columbia. Further, the compensation rate under the act is the measure of compensation paid by the Federal Government under the War Hazards Act for injuries to Government contractors' employees working on defense bases and on contracts outside of the United States. The total coverage of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act, as extended, is estimated to be between 500,000 and 600,000 employees.

THE SPECIAL FUND

This special fund is not established by appropriations from the Congress but is derived from amounts paid by employers in the stevedoring industry covered by the act, and from fines and penalties collected.

In cases of fatal injury where there are no survivors eligible for benefits under the act, the employer of a deceased employee is required to pay \$1,000 into a special fund in the Treasury. These nondependency-payment requirements, which are usual in compensation systems, tend to equalize the liability of all employers under a particular system. Under the existing law, the sums so paid in, together with fines and penalties collected for infractions of the act, are authorized to be spent for specified purposes.

Receipts into the fund under the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act for the past few years have averaged approximately \$35,000 a year and disbursements have averaged only \$10,000. The principal of the fund, therefore, increases constantly and on June 30, 1954, totaled \$734,522.

COMPARISON OF PRESENT AND PROPOSED USES OF SPECIAL FUND

When an injury compensable under the act occurs to an employee who had a previous injury, and the combined result of the two injuries is to create permanent total dis-

ability, payment from the special fund is authorized with respect to the total disability, after the employer has completed the payments for which he is liable in connection with the second injury. The present law requires that 50 percent of the amount paid by each employer into the fund shall be made available for payments in connection with second injuries. The bill establishes a priority for payments from the entire fund for this purpose but it does not freeze any portion of the fund for one use.

Payment from the special fund is also authorized up to \$10 a week for the maintenance of employees undergoing vocational rehabilitation. The maximum allowance now authorized for payment from the fund for this purpose would be increased under the proposal from \$10 a week to \$25 a week. The present maximum is too meager to be a worthwhile supplement to the economic resources of employees undergoing training to refit them for gainful employment.

The Secretary of Labor is authorized to use the fund, in addition, for the limited purpose of furnishing prosthetic appliances or other apparatus to refit an injured employee for employment. The bill also authorizes the Secretary of Labor to use the special fund to procure rehabilitation services in those cases where necessary services are not otherwise available through existing facilities. The expanded Federal-State rehabilitation program authorized by the Vocational Rehabilitation Act of 1954 may be expected to reduce to a minimum the number of rehabilitation cases requiring services supplementary to those offered by the program. It is important, however, to take care of the unusual cases where by reason of extraordinary circumstances, rehabilitation would otherwise be foreclosed.

Despite the safeguards of the Longshoremen's and Harbor Workers' Compensation Act for the securing of compensation protection by employers for employees, a few cases occur in which the insolvency of the employer or his estate precludes the collection of compensation awarded under the act. The bill authorizes the payment of awards in the discretion of the Secretary of Labor in such cases from the special fund to provide relief to employees who otherwise would have no recourse to payments from their employers.

Further, the Secretary of Labor would be permitted to use the special fund, in such amounts as may be authorized in annual appropriations, for administrative expenses involved in aiding employees to obtain rehabilitation and encouraging their use of available facilities.

AMENDMENT OF FEDERAL EMPLOYEES' COMPENSATION ACT

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill amending the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, to provide that the various Federal agencies shall be charged with their share of the cost of workmen's compensation.

I am particularly gratified to have the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL] as a cosponsor of this bill.

President Eisenhower said, in his budget message:

At present all workmen's compensation payments to Federal employees are provided from a single appropriation. To encourage better safety practices, I shall recommend legislation to shift the financing of some of these benefit payments to the employing Federal agency.

This bill is designed to carry out that part of the President's budget message,

and is a part of the current legislative program of the Department of Labor.

I desire, Mr. President, to pay full tribute to my colleague and cosponsor, the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], for his long record of interest, imagination, and activity in the field of promoting industrial and office safety, especially as it affects the workers of our Federal Government. As a matter of fact, the bill we are now introducing is essentially the same as one title of a broader Federal Government safety bill introduced in the last Congress by the Senator from Massachusetts.

As President Eisenhower noted, presently the cost of injuries to Federal Government workers, or death benefits, is met by a single direct appropriation. This bill would intensify the effort of employing agencies to reduce their accident rate, by assessing premium charges against each of the agencies based on manual rates as modified by the accident experience of that agency. The cost of these premium charges will be met from the appropriations of the individual agencies.

Mr. President, when an agency comes before the Appropriations Committees of Congress for its annual appropriation, the premium rate assessed against it will immediately be evident. If, by reason of a high accident rate, an agency is charged a high premium rate, it is obvious that there will be an additional and powerful incentive to reduce accidents. I hope that the Congress will provide this incentive by enacting this legislation expeditiously.

I ask unanimous consent that the text of this bill and a short explanatory statement be printed at the conclusion of my remarks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the bill and explanation will be printed in the RECORD.

The bill (S. 1309) to amend the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, approved September 7, 1916, as amended, by providing for reimbursement of expenditures from the employees compensation fund by Federal employing agencies, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. SMITH of New Jersey (for himself and Mr. SALTONSTALL), was received, read twice by its title, referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, and ordered to be printed in the RECORD, together with the explanation, as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 9 of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, as amended (5 U. S. C. 1952 edition, sec. 759) is further amended by adding at the end thereof a new subsection reading as follows:

"(c) The Secretary is authorized to enter into agreements with other Federal agencies for the furnishing of medical and other services of the kind provided for by this section, and for reimbursement to the agency furnishing the services of the approximate cost thereof as shall be agreed upon. The cost of furnishing such services shall be reimbursed or paid from the Employees' Compensation Fund."

SEC. 2. Section 24 of such act as amended (5 U. S. C. 1952 edition, sec. 774) is further amended by inserting before the first sen-

tence thereof the designation "(a)" and by adding at the end of such section a new subsection reading as follows:

"(b) Whoever, being an officer or employee of the United States knowingly and willfully falsifies, conceals, or covers up by any trick, scheme, or device, a material fact in relation to the injury or death of a person compensable under the provisions of this act or any extension or application thereof, or makes any false, fictitious, or fraudulent statement or representation, or makes or uses any false writing or document knowing the same to contain any false, fictitious, or fraudulent statement or entry, in relation to such an injury or death, or induces or compels any person to forego the filing of any claim for compensation or other benefits provided under this act or any extension or application thereof, or retains any notice, report, claim, or paper which is required to be filed under this act or any extension or application thereof, or regulations promulgated thereunder, shall be fined not more than \$5,000 or imprisoned not more than two years, or both."

SEC. 3. Section 35 of such act, as amended (5 U. S. C. 1952 edition, sec. 785) is further amended to read as follows:

"SEC. 35 (a) There is established in the Treasury a separate fund to be known as the Employees' Compensation Fund which shall consist of the unexpended balances of moneys heretofore appropriated for the purposes thereof, together with such sums as the Congress may from time to time appropriate therefor or transfer thereto, and amounts otherwise accruing thereto under this section. Such fund, including all additions that may be made to it by appropriation or otherwise, shall be available without time limit for the payment of the compensation, medical benefits, sums advanced as costs for enforcement of liability in third-party cases as required or as undertaken by the Secretary pursuant to section 26 of this act, and such other benefits and payments as are provided for by this act or any extension or application thereof, except as may otherwise be provided by this or other acts.

"(b) Except as otherwise provided in subsection (e) of this section, each executive department and each agency or instrumentality of the United States, or other establishment, having employees who are or may be entitled to compensation under this act or any extension or application thereof (hereinafter called "agency") shall contribute to the maintenance of the employees' compensation fund by the payment of premium charges based upon manual rates computed in a manner consistent with commercial insurance practice on the basis of experience under this act as applied to payrolls. The Secretary of Labor from time to time shall determine and promulgate such rates which shall be fair, reasonable, and adequate. As to all risks involving similar kinds and degrees of hazards the basic rates charged shall be the same: *Provided, however,* That in determining premium charges such rates may be adjusted to reflect an agency's loss experience by merit or experience rating. Premium charges may be made on the basis of employment in a particular office, bureau, or other constituent unit of an agency for which annual or other appropriations are made for personal services, or in such other manner as the Secretary of Labor may determine will best assist in the evaluation of trends with respect to safety at the various operational levels. Premium charges shall be determined prospectively on an annual basis, and readjustment of such charges may be made at any time on account of errors, changes in classifications of employments or extent of payroll exposure, or because of other similar factors which distort proper premium charges: *Provided,* That there shall be no retroactive readjustment of the manual rates.

"(c) The respective premium charges shall be determined by the Secretary of Labor together with a charge for administrative expenses, and billed by him annually, quarterly or such other times as may be requested by the head of each agency concerned. The head of the agency concerned shall cause the said charges to be paid promptly from the respective appropriations and funds of the agency and its constituent units, such payments to be placed to the credit of the employees' compensation fund, to remain available thereafter for the payment of benefit costs and other payments heretofore or hereafter authorized by statute.

"(d) The Secretary of Labor is authorized to expend from such fund, for the necessary administrative expenses of his Department and within such limitations as may be set in appropriation acts annually. Premium charges and charges for administration of claims shall be subject to such readjustment and correction as may be found necessary, including repayment from the employees' compensation fund to the appropriation against which such charge was made. Should the Secretary of Labor determine at any time that there has developed in such fund a surplus of premiums over losses, which in his judgment is larger than is necessary adequately to safeguard the solvency of the fund, the Secretary shall cause such excess to be transferred into miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury.

"(e) Each agency required by this act to contribute through the payment of premium charges to such fund shall, at such time, and in such manner and form as may be determined by the Secretary of Labor, furnish the Secretary with payroll reports. Each agency shall upon request make its payroll records available to the Department of Labor for inspection and audit for premium-making purposes.

"(f) The provisions of this section in respect of the fixing and charging of premiums shall not apply to any agency, other than an executive department, with respect to any fiscal year if on June 30 of the second preceding fiscal year it had less than 5,000 employees in its employ or in the cases of members of any Reserve components of the military forces of the United States (including Reserve and auxiliary of the Coast Guard) while serving as such members or persons engaged in emergency relief employment, or to persons to whom the benefits under this act or any extension or application thereof are payable from sources other than the Employees' Compensation Fund. Loss experience under this act arising from war-risk hazard (as defined by the Secretary of Labor) shall be excluded from the experience which is used under subsection (b) for ratemaking and premium rates shall not include any loading for war-risk hazard as so defined.

"(g) Payments to the Employees' Compensation Fund under this section shall be made from the respective appropriations and funds which are used for payment of the salaries, wages, or other compensation of the covered employees of the several agencies."

SEC. 4. All provisions of law, other than those included in this act, which require contribution or payment by any agency to the Employees' Compensation Fund are hereby superseded as to any agency required to comply with the provisions of section 35 of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act as amended by this act: *Provided*, That this provision shall not be construed as in any way affecting the liability of an agency for contributions in respect to compensation and other benefits for injury (or death from injury) where the injury occurred prior to the effective date of this act.

SEC. 5. Section 4 of this act shall take effect January 1, 1956, and the first period for which charges shall be made as provided in section 3 of this act shall commence on January 1, 1956.

EXPLANATION OF THE PROVISIONS OF SENATE BILL 1309

These provisions are intended to reduce the personal accident toll in Federal service by amending the Federal Employees' Compensation Act to charge the various Federal employing agencies with their workmen's compensation costs.

This particular legislation is intended to carry out the objective of the President expressed in his recent budget message to encourage better safety practices in Federal employment by shifting the financing of benefit payments in employment injury cases from a single appropriation to the appropriations of the employing agencies. These provisions have been approved by the Bureau of the Budget as being in accord with the program of the President.

It is of utmost importance that the Federal Government should intensify its effort to reduce the accident rate among its employees. If the various departments and agencies are made more aware of the incidence of accidents in employments within their responsibility more effective safety measures should be adopted and the number of accidents in the employments reduced.

PREMIUM FIXING

Premium costs will be fixed and charged to the various agencies in accordance with accident experience under the Compensation Act. The assessment of premium charges upon each agency based on manual rates, as modified by the accident experience of that agency, is designed to make the agencies aware of their injury records and the success of their efforts in accident prevention. Further, when appropriations are sought by the individual agencies to defray premium costs, the premium rate will furnish a concise indication to the Congress of their accident records.

The shifting of accident costs to the employing agencies is a good business practice, consistent with business methods followed in underwriting workmen's compensation. This financing should also result in better safety practices for the Nation's largest employer.

CONTINUING AUTHORITY FOR INTERAGENCY MEDICAL SERVICE

The Secretary of Labor would be authorized to enter into agreements with other Federal agencies for the furnishing of medical and related services required under the act and for the reimbursement to the cooperating agencies of the approximate cost of the services rendered. At the present time it is necessary for the annual appropriation acts to carry this authorization.

SANCTIONS FOR MAINTAINING FALSE RECORDS OF SAFETY

A section would be added imposing sanctions for concealing material facts relating to injury or death. This section is intended to discourage any tendency by any agency official to establish a false record of safety.

The following is a section-by-section analysis of the "charge-back" provisions:

"SECTIONAL ANALYSIS OF SENATE BILL 1309"

"SECTION 1. REIMBURSEMENT TO GOVERNMENT AGENCIES FOR MEDICAL SERVICE"

"This section would add to an existing section of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act (sec. 9) a new subsection which would authorize the Secretary of Labor to enter into agreements with other Federal agencies for the furnishing of medical and other services required under the act and for the reimbursement to the cooperating agency of the approximate cost of the services rendered.

"A provision of this kind has for years been carried in appropriation acts for the Bureau of Employees' Compensation, De-

partment of Labor. It more appropriately belongs in the act itself.

"SECTION 2. SANCTIONS FOR CAUSING INACCURATE ACCIDENT RECORDS AND HAMPERING THE FILING OF CLAIMS"

"This section would amend section 24 of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act by inserting a new subsection, the purpose of which is to impose sanctions for concealing material facts in relation to injury or death; or for making false statements or representations; or for making or using false writings or entries in relation to injury situations; or for inducing or compelling a person to forego the filing of a claim or for retaining a claim or other paper required to be filed under the act.

"In the administration of the Federal Employees' Compensation Act, it has been alleged over the years that some individuals have discouraged employees and dependents from filing claims in bona fide injury and death situations, merely to make a showing of an apparently good—though fictitious—safety record. This proposed section is intended to discourage any such actions and to impose sanctions where the forbidden acts are done.

"SECTION 3. PREMIUM CHARGING METHOD"

"This is the principal section setting up the premium charging method.

"Compensation funds"

"Subsection (a) embodies largely the basic content of the present section 35 of the Compensation Act; namely, it provides for the establishment of the employees' compensation fund. The additions to the old statutory language are those necessary to integrate the section with the new charging system. Included in subsection (a) is a provision with respect to advancement of costs for enforcement of third party liability, a provision that has appeared in the annual appropriation acts of the Bureau for many years, but which more appropriately belongs in this section.

"Payment of premium charges"

"Subsection (b) contains the requirement that agencies contribute to the maintenance of the employees' compensation fund by the payment of premium charges. It is intended that the premium charges will be determined in the same manner as premium charges are determined in the United States under other workmen's compensation laws; that is, the loss experience will be tabulated and premium rates will be established from this experience and published in manual form with appropriate rates for the various classifications of employments. The several classifications will reflect the relative hazards of the employments covered. The manual rates for the various classifications will then be applied to the appropriate payrolls in the generally accepted manner, and the resulting premium will represent the charge against the agency as its annual contribution to the upkeep of the employees' compensation fund.

"The basic manual rates will apply to all agencies alike. However, in determining the premium charges, adjustments will be made to reflect a particular agency's loss experience. Premiums will thus reflect an agency's merit or experience rating. This means, for example, that if an agency is able to hold down its losses, a favorable premium adjustment will be made reflecting that ability. An agency's premium will thus be a barometer to gauge the extent to which it operates safely.

"The bill contemplates that the premium charges will be made at operational levels within departments and large agencies, particularly at levels at which appropriations are made for personal services by the Congress. In this connection the bill provides that the Secretary of Labor may approve any

other manner of making the premium charges if the manner selected will best assist in the evaluation of safety trends at the various operational levels. Provision has been included for correcting errors in premium charges, for example, where there is a fluctuation of employment or extent of payroll exposure or other similar factors not known at the time the premium charge was made.

"Administrative expenses"

"Subsection (c) authorizes adding to the pure premium charge a charge for administrative expenses. The premium charge and the loading for administrative expenses would be billed on a periodic basis and would be paid from appropriated or other funds of the agency.

"Disbursement for administrative expenses"

"Subsection (d) would authorize the expenditure from the employees' compensation fund by the Secretary of Labor of amounts necessary for administration, within such limitations as Congress may set in appropriation acts annually. Included in this subsection is a provision the effect of which is to authorize the transfer to miscellaneous receipts of the Treasury any accumulation in the employees' compensation fund of a surplus of premiums over losses.

"Payroll inspection"

"Subsection (e) is designed to give the Secretary of Labor authority to make the usual inspection of payroll records necessary for the audit of payrolls for premium-making purposes. This is the usual kind of authority and function which insurance companies exercise in checking an employer's records to verify the accuracy of the premium charge.

"Exceptions from premium payments"

"Subsection (f) contains such exclusions of agencies and types of employments from premium charging as are deemed appropriate. The first of these is the exclusion of the smaller agencies, that is, those having less than 5,000 employees. The next exclusion is of members of the Reserve components of the military forces. The basis for compensation eligibility for such members differs from that applicable to the ordinary civilian employees. To include military loss experience would distort the rate basis for civilian employments. Other reasons exist for eliminating this class of covered individuals from the premium-charging plan.

"In addition, relief employments, if any, would be excluded. Where benefits under the act are paid to persons from sources other than the employees' compensation fund, no premium charge would be made with respect to the employments of such persons. In order that the premiums may reflect true occupational injury hazards and no other, a provision has been added to exclude from the basic experience used for rating-making purposes those losses which can be identified as due to war risks. (During World War II, the insurance purchased by the Government for Government contractors' employees was written without a factor for war-risk hazard so as not to distort the proper premiums.)

"Agency personnel"

"Subsection (g) is an authorizing subsection under which the several agencies would be permitted to use their appropriations and funds for salaries, wages, or other compensation, for the purpose of making payments for the charges billed to them by the Secretary.

"SECTION 4. SUBSTITUTION FOR PRESENT METHODS OF FUND REIMBURSEMENT"

"This section is designed to provide for the substitution of the premium-charging method for the other methods by which at present the employees' compensation fund

may be reimbursed. There are at present four statutory provisions requiring agencies to contribute to the employees' compensation fund on the basis of annual billings. (These four statutes provide for the inclusion in the billing of a fair portion of the cost of administration.) The statutes are: Civil Aeronautics Act of 1938 (sec. 1306 (e)); Small Business Act of 1953 (sec. 206 (b)); Virgin Islands Corporation Act (sec. 7 (c)); and the act incorporating the Panama Railroad (sec. 252, Canal Zone Code).

"SECTION 5. EFFECTIVE DATE"

"This section would make section 4 of the act effective January 1, 1956. On that date the first period for which charges are to be made would commence. The other provisions of the act would go into effect upon enactment so that work could get under way to establish the manual rates and the necessary procedures well in advance of the effective date for charging purposes."

Mr. SALTONSTALL. Mr. President, I am certainly glad to have this opportunity to join my distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], in sponsoring this bill, which is designed to improve the performance of the Federal Government and its workers in the field of accident prevention and general safety.

To date, the Government's performance in this field is shockingly bad. Every year preventable accidents to Government employees are causing untold human suffering. In compensation payments, medical care, and loss of work, they are costing American taxpayers millions and millions of dollars.

According to Labor Department records, 486,062 civilian Federal employees were injured in the 6-year period from 1947 to 1952. Fatal accidents took the lives of 1,547 Federal workers. Man-days lost totaled 17,725,358. Direct and indirect accident costs to the Federal Government during the 6-year period amounted to more than \$563 million for occupational accidents alone.

Production time lost as the direct result of disabling injuries was the equivalent of the loss of 77,066 workers. In man-hours, the cost to the taxpayer totaled more than \$217 million, at an average hourly rate of \$1.54.

In March of last year, I introduced a bill to provide for the establishment in the Department of Labor of a Federal Safety Division, and for other purposes. Several valid objections were registered to this bill, relative to the establishment at this time of such a Federal Safety Division; but other provisions of the bill, now contained and amplified in the bill being introduced today by the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH] and myself, have the complete approval of the Secretary of Labor and the Bureau of the Budget. They represent a very sound and promising implementation of existing safety programs within the Federal Government, and should, we feel, have the complete support of the Congress.

As the Senator from New Jersey has said, President Eisenhower in his budget message has recommended passage of this measure, in order that improved safety practices throughout the Federal Government may be encouraged.

Mr. President, this bill is a product of discussions and study with the De-

partment of Labor, the Bureau of the Budget, the Social Security Administration, and the National Safety Council, in company with representatives of Government employees' unions. I hope very much that hearings on the bill will be scheduled soon, for I believe it represents another forward step toward a real improvement in the safety record of the Federal Government, a record which is very much less effective than that of private industry. Only as thoughtful steps such as this are taken can we achieve the objective we seek; namely, that of reducing and, whenever possible, preventing accidents, injuries, and fatalities among our Federal workers.

INCREASED INSURANCE PROTECTION OF DEPOSITORS IN FEDERALLY INSURED BANKS

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to increase the insurance protection of depositors in federally insured banks from \$10,000 to \$20,000.

In my State there are many counties which have only 1, 2, or 3 banks; and it is a matter of much inconvenience to depositors who desire to have their deposit guaranteed by the Federal Deposit Insurance Corporation to be limited to the inadequate amount of \$10,000.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1313) to increase the insurance protection of depositors in federally insured banks from \$10,000 to \$20,000, introduced by Mr. LANGER, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

AMENDMENT OF IMMIGRATION AND NATIONALITY ACT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], and the junior Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], I introduce for appropriate reference a bill to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act. It is a bill designed to reintroduce the spirit of humanitarian compassion and democracy into our immigration laws. It is my hope that the Senate Judiciary Committee will look upon this effort kindly and will report the bill to the Senate floor favorably.

The Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952 was not a controversial issue in the recent election campaign. Candidates of both majority political parties made clear their understanding that our present laws were in some respects discriminatory and undesirable. The President of the United States has declared that to be his position. Our effort with this bill is to correct some of those discriminatory and undesirable portions.

Our bill does not constitute a complete revision of the present Immigration and Nationality Act. It does not go so far as I would like it to go. However, it is a fair beginning on which reasonable men of both parties can agree at this

time. It would ameliorate some of the harsh provisions of existing law, making the law more flexible and adaptable to change in world conditions. It would aid us in carrying out our foreign-policy objectives and thus help us to combat communism. It will also go far toward relieving the continuous pressure for emergency immigration legislation.

We introduce the bill in the spirit of modest progress and progressive change. We introduce it in the hope that it can represent a consensus of nonpartisan opinion designed to help democratize our immigration and nationality laws.

More specifically, the bill accomplishes the following:

First. Section 1 restores to professors eligibility for nonquota status—which they enjoyed prior to the McCarran Act—if a university requests their services. This proposed change is based on a feeling of confidence that our universities will select only well-qualified persons for employment on their teaching staffs. It, therefore, abolishes the unnecessary red tape and delay involved in requiring universities to obtain clearance orders from the local employment service and then proving to the Immigration Service that the professor whose immigration is being sponsored is needed urgently in the United States. My amendment in no way changes the security requirements of our laws as they concern all who wish to enter the United States.

Second. Section 2 would grant to certain adopted children the immigration status enjoyed by natural children. This change would have 2 important effects: (a) it would make it unnecessary for adopted children of American citizens, in many instances of servicemen, to wait their turn on the quota or, as happens so often, to require that Congress pass a special bill on their behalf; (b) it would make adopted children of aliens eligible for the same quota status or quota preference as that enjoyed by natural children, thus avoiding the heartbreaking situations in which adopted children force their family to delay their trip to the United States or have to be left behind.

As section 2 applies only to children adopted prior to their reaching the age of 14 years, and as it specifically excepts children adopted solely for the purpose of obtaining immigration preference for them, the danger of abuse is avoided.

Third. Section 3 repeals the provision of the present law under which some quotas, generally those which are needed most urgently, are mortgaged for decades, in some cases even for centuries.

Fourth. Section 4 ends one of the racially discriminatory features of the present law. It abolishes the racial ancestry blood test for persons "attributable by as much as one-half of their ancestry to a people or peoples indigenous to the Asia-Pacific triangle." Henceforth, all visa applicants would be classified only according to their place of birth.

Fifth. While section 4 still retains the national-origins principle, sections 5 and 6 would go far toward ameliorating its harsh effects. They do that without raising the existing overall quota ceiling

of about 154,000. They simply provide that if, in any given year, no takers are found for any portion of these 154,000 numbers, that portion is not declared forfeited, as under present law, but is made available during the following year, without regard to national origins to (a) persons of special skills, (b) close relatives of citizens or alien residents, (c) persecutees, and (d) other groups of persons whose emigration to the United States would further our foreign policy.

Another change effected by this section concerns the problem of family unification. Under present law, a person qualifying under the national-need preference may enter this country with his wife and minor children, all of whom are covered by the preference. A person qualifying for preference as the brother of an American citizen, however, must leave his wife and children behind and can get a preference for them only after he has arrived in this country. Under the change provided for by this section, the preference right shall apply not only to the person directly affected, but also to his spouse and minor children so as to enable families to enter this country as single units.

Sixth. It has often been said that a man who tries to import a sack of beans into the United States and finds that it has been excluded, has the right of appeal, but a man who wants to bring his mother over, and finds that she has been denied a visa, has no such right. Section 7 of my bill is designed to change that situation. It is designed to modify the anomaly of the present Immigration Act under which authority for the acts of the Immigration Service—which acts in many instances through the Board of Immigration Appeals—is concentrated in the hands of the Attorney General, while authority for the acts of the Consular Service is diffused among the numerous consuls, each of whom is the final arbiter in the visa application cases before him. Section 7 concentrates responsibility in a visa review board appointed by the Secretary of State, to which the sponsors of prospective immigrants may be allowed to appeal. This board would assure that visa regulations are enforced uniformly throughout the world and would also safeguard against irresponsible and capricious acts by individual consular officers.

Seventh. The concept of justice tempered with mercy is a part of our administration of law. It is deeply imbedded in our religious traditions. It was in conformity with that concept that Congress long ago gave the Attorney General discretionary authority to suspend deportation in deserving cases. That authority was severely curtailed by the Immigration and Nationality Act of 1952, the Senate majority report on which states harshly and cruelly:

Hardship or even unusual hardship to the alien or to his spouse, parent, or child is not sufficient to justify suspension of deportation.

Under section 8 of this bill the standards for suspension of deportation contained in the law in effect prior to the adoption of the McCarran Act are re-

stored. As suspension of deportation will only be granted in the discretion of the Attorney General and only with the concurrence of Congress, I am certain that there is no danger of this humanitarian provision being abused.

Eighth. Sections 9 and 10 are purely procedural.

Our proposal is a reasonable one. It provides a meeting ground on which those of us who oppose the 1952 act can unite with those who support it with certain reservations.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1315) to amend the Immigration and Nationality Act, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY (for himself, Mr. DOUGLAS, Mr. KENNEDY, and Mr. McNAMARA), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

FUNDS FOR WIND EROSION CONTROL MEASURES

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the senior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the senior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. CHAVEZ], the senior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. KERR], my colleague, the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN], the junior Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONROE], the junior Senator from Wyoming [Mr. O'MAHONEY], and the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPP], I introduce, for appropriate reference, a bill to make available unexpended balances of funds heretofore appropriated for the agricultural conservation program for wind erosion control measures.

Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to speak briefly with reference to this bill.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Does the Senator desire to speak more than 2 minutes?

Mr. ALLOTT. My remarks will take slightly more than 2 minutes and less than 4 minutes.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the Senator may proceed.

The bill (S. 1319) to make available unexpended balances of funds heretofore appropriated for the agricultural conservation program for wind erosion control measures, and for other purposes, introduced by Mr. ALLOTT (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

Mr. ALLOTT. Mr. President, many of my colleagues will remember that last session the senior Senator from Colorado [Mr. MILLIKIN] was joined by 15 other Senators, in presenting to the Congress a resolution asking that special funds be set aside for the use in areas suffering from excessive wind erosion.

This money was appropriated in the amount of \$15 million under the heading "Department of Agriculture, Agri-

cultural Conservation Program" in the Third Supplemental Appropriation Act of 1954.

At the time the authority for the use of these funds expired on December 31, 1954, there remained approximately \$7,147,000 in the fund. It is that amount which we ask the Congress to authorize the Secretary of Agriculture to have available.

The facts of the situation are that in many of the areas where an emergency existed last year, there has been no moisture in quantities which will assure as favorable a situation as in 1954. At that time, much of the land did have some submoisture which is not present today. We hope that we will have rain or snow and that none of this money may be needed, but we must be prepared to cope with the situation when the spring winds commence.

Unfortunately, the conditions that make possible these wind erosion disasters are largely beyond human control. Lack of normal rainfall and severe winds in the spring months comprise the raw material of soil erosion.

The area chiefly affected has been suffering drought or near drought conditions for the past 4 years. The situation has become progressively worse. In eastern Colorado, precipitation, rainfall, and snow are from 30 to 60 percent of normal for the past 6 months. Similar conditions exist, at least to some extent, in southwestern Nebraska, Kansas, Oklahoma, and northern Texas, with some areas in Wyoming in the danger zone. Unfortunately, Colorado seems to be in the worst condition.

Much wind damage has occurred during December and January. In the States of Colorado, Wyoming, Nebraska, Kansas, New Mexico, Oklahoma, and Texas more than 4 million acres have been damaged, of which number all but a million acres are in Colorado. Numerous letters and telegrams inform me that land is now blowing and eroding in southeastern Colorado. As of February 1, Department of Agriculture figures show that in these same States more than 20 million acres are classified as in a condition to blow. This includes cropland and rangeland, as well as other land.

Needless to say, we hope that we shall not need to use this money, but my colleagues and I are asking that this program be reinstituted so that in the event of calamity, rapid rescue operations can begin.

Another example of the seriousness of the situation for the farmers in Great Plains States can be best exemplified by these figures for Colorado. The receipts from the sale of farm products in Colorado have been reduced \$163 million during the past 2-year period. This is \$163 million less that the farmer has to spend, not only in Colorado, but to buy the products of industry all over the country. A great portion of this loss of income can be attributed to the drought. Multiply this by like figures in other States of the Great Plains, and the impact upon our farm economy is plain to see.

Official reports reaching me indicate that farmers have had to borrow over \$7 million in my State from the Farm Home Administration alone. They have reduced their foundation herds of livestock chiefly for the lack of feed and pasture. In Colorado since the drought and duststorm of 1954, the farmers have reduced their foundation herds as follows: Beef cattle, down 70,000 head; stock sheep, down 58,000 head; dairy cattle, down 4,000 head.

I urge the Members of the Congress to go on record quickly and to empower the Secretary of Agriculture to put into effect the assistance so necessary to protect the farmlands of the West.

In many areas this is already an emergency. It must not become a catastrophe.

Mr. CARLSON subsequently said: Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks made by the distinguished junior Senator from Colorado [Mr. ALLOTT], who spoke on the need for sufficient funds to be made available immediately in areas where there is danger of soil erosion because of wind.

It seems to me that the important factor in connection with the bill is to have the funds made available quickly to the Secretary of Agriculture, for use at the earliest opportunity, because the funds will be most effective when they are used promptly.

CONSTRUCTION OF MEDICAL EDUCATIONAL AND RESEARCH FACILITIES

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], the Senator from West Virginia [Mr. NEELY], the Senator from New York [Mr. LEHMAN], the Senator from Michigan [Mr. McNAMARA], the junior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. HUMPHREY], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], I introduce for appropriate reference, a bill to authorize a 5-year program of grants to accredited medical schools to be used for expanding, remodeling, or constructing facilities needed for the training of doctors.

The bill was worked out in a series of conferences with the committee on financing of the Association of American Medical Colleges and has been unanimously endorsed by the executive council of the association. The bill conforms to the principles approved by the house of delegates of the American Medical Association.

All the approved medical schools in the Nation today number but 74. Many are housed in buildings half a century or more old. To establish one new medical school can cost as much as \$25 million. The costs involved in reconstructing and modernizing old facilities are likewise great. Almost without exception, our medical schools are today confronted

with serious financial problems. Through the fine efforts of private groups, the National Fund for Medical Education has raised some \$7 million since 1949. Yet even if the fund succeeded in attaining its goal of \$10 million a year for the support of medical education, such an amount would be no more than our medical schools must have to meet necessary costs of operation and maintenance.

The medical schools on which we rely to provide the Nation with an adequate supply of properly trained doctors must have assistance for the construction of new facilities and for the expansion and rehabilitation of existing facilities.

The bill which we have today introduced authorizes \$250 million over a 5-year period, to be used for construction grants. The bill contains specific guaranties against any Federal interference with or control over the schools. Such guaranties are essential to preserve our free system of American medicine, the best in the world.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be received and appropriately referred.

The bill (S. 1323) to authorize a 5-year program of grants for construction of medical educational and research facilities, introduced by Mr. HILL (for himself and other Senators), was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on Labor and Public Welfare.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, as a cosponsor of the bill which has been introduced by the Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL], I wish to make a few brief remarks.

The bill to authorize a 5-year program of grants for construction of educational and research facilities for our medical schools, in which I have joined as a cosponsor, involves a recognition by Congress not only of an important public need but also of assistance by the Government in a program of the highest potential value to the future well-being of the people of this country.

Our medical schools, despite generous private gifts and endowments and the contributions of various States, have not been able to meet their most urgent requirements for buildings and facilities.

Without such facilities we cannot hope to have an adequate number of properly qualified and trained physicians, teachers, and research scientists.

The proposed legislation would make \$50 million available in each of the next 5 years for grants for construction to accredited medical schools.

In most cases the grant would represent 50 percent of the cost of construction, although larger shares would be provided where enrollment increases warrant it or in the case of new schools.

No grant or grants to any medical school for the total 5-year program would exceed \$3 million for construction, exclusive of grants up to \$25,000 for preparing initial plans.

While the main emphasis in the bill is placed on construction, it is provided that up to 20 percent may be allocated to permanent endowment for maintenance.

During the past 2 years when I was chairman of the Subcommittee on Appropriations for Health, Education, and Welfare, I made a special study of the needs of our medical schools for expansion of their educational and research facilities.

I visited the University of Minnesota during the course of this survey and found that despite the establishment of the Mayo Memorial and greatly expanded medical and research facilities there was need for surgical research laboratories, a clinical cancer research building, additions to the Heart Hospital, for a faculty and student medical library, and for a residence hall for graduate medical students engaged in research.

These needs are typical of many of our medical schools.

Last fall, Dr. Harold S. Diehl, dean of the medical sciences at the University of Minnesota, wrote me as follows:

If we are to provide more and better trained personnel in medicine, dentistry, nursing, medical technology, physical therapy, occupational therapy, and other health service fields, one of the fundamental and basic needs is for improved and expanded facilities.

The same basic necessity applies to the expansion of medical research activities.

Emphasis on the need for added facilities in our medical schools was also emphasized in a letter which I received from Dr. Owen V. Wangensteen, chief of the department of surgery at the medical school of the University of Minnesota.

Dr. Wangensteen wrote me as follows:

Ideas and men are, of course, of the greatest importance in any research venture.

Nevertheless these men must have a place to work.

A year ago Surgeon General Scheele's office had indications of requests for help running into millions of dollars for medical schools throughout the country.

In many areas, that need is urgent.

I have the definite feeling that one to two million dollars could be employed usefully and immediately in a large number of medical schools throughout the country to give helpful impetus to medical research work now in progress in the area of cancer and heart disease alone.

Mr. President, I reported my observations last year in a letter to the chairman of the Committee on Appropriations.

I ask unanimous consent that this letter, dated July 16, 1954, be printed in the RECORD at this point as a part of my remarks.

There being no objection, the letter was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., July 16, 1954.
The Honorable STYLES BRIDGES,
Chairman, Appropriations Committee,
United States Senate,

Washington, D. C.
DEAR SENATOR BRIDGES: This is in reference to your communication of July 1 wherein you made further mention of our conversation concerning the applications that have been received by myself as chairman of the Subcommittee on Health, Education, and Welfare appropriations and that some of the college and university officials had recommended that the Federal Govern-

ment appropriate funds to assist them in developing the research activities of these educational institutions to the maximum. At my earliest opportunity I visited the University of Minnesota as I had received a communication from Dr. Owen H. Wangensteen, of the University of Minnesota, setting forth their research activities and also their great need of assistance as it is impossible to obtain sufficient funds to continue expanding not only the necessary space but the laboratory equipment.

It is at the University of Minnesota that a young surgeon, Dr. C. Walton Lillehei, is making it possible to open the heart in man for more than a half-hour to repair congenital defects within the heart. He is making it possible to enlarge the scope of surgery of the heart considerably. This is a monumental contribution—perhaps the most important surgical contribution in this area of work in our generation. Dr. Lillehei had the idea of how to do it; he worked it out in the experimental laboratory. He then applied it to patients. I would say that the nature of this contribution could not be estimated in money—yes, not even in millions or billions. It is that important.

I was privileged last Saturday, July 10, to witness such a surgical performance on a dog, where the second dog was used as the host for the purpose of purifying the blood while the arteries were separated from the other dog's heart that was under surgery. It was unbelievable, and yet research has accomplished it. Only through this intensified research activity at this University of Minnesota has this been accomplished. Think of the thousands into the hundreds of thousands of blue babies and others afflicted with a defective heart who can be saved and be permitted to lead a normal life.

A university or college that has developed in this manner in the field of research cannot possibly find the means to finance itself. It is for that reason that I definitely believe that the Federal Government should make a very careful study of this question. I am taking the matter up with Mrs. Hobby, the Secretary of the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare. I have already discussed it with her assistant, Mr. Nelson Rockefeller, in the hopes that this appropriations need can be brought to the attention of the Budget Bureau in order that this Bureau may give consideration to such an appropriation and that we in Congress may have the benefit of a recommendation from the Budget Bureau as we reconvene in the 84th Congress.

I believe that it would be better if we handle the funds for such research facility construction in much the same manner as we now appropriate and make available funds for cancer, heart, mental health, and the other health research assistances. By handling the funds in such a manner, the specific worthy projects that were proven and approved by the national health authorities would be granted the funds to continue in their research.

Now again referring to the activities at the University of Minnesota, where I made this specific investigation and study of what their needs are, both Dr. Wangensteen, one of the noted surgeons of this Nation, and Dr. Harold S. Diehl, the Dean of the Medical School of the University of Minnesota, discussed every phase of their needs and what their future plans are. It would be my surmise that the University of Minnesota at the present moment could well use somewhere in the area of \$3 million and even possibly \$4 million immediately and directly to satisfy present existing urgent needs for laboratory space to give momentum to research which is now in progress.

I am certain were we to visit other educational institutions that have proven their ability and scientific leadership in this field

of medical and surgical research that we would find a need much similar to what exists at the University of Minnesota.

Sincerely yours,

EDWARD J. THYE,
United States Senator.

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, the basic problem that needs to be considered, aside from the obvious benefits to the people of this country of enlarged medical education and research facilities, is the number of doctors that are needed for an expanding population.

Since 1910, the population has increased 75 percent yet the annual number of medical-school graduates has increased only 54.5 percent.

An accepted ratio is 1 active doctor for every 750 people.

Our net rise in population in 1954 demanded a net increase of 3,333 new doctors, yet our actual increase of new doctors was only 2,816.

Beginning with an estimated shortage of 20,000 doctors in this country, it is apparent that if this trend is not changed the ratio of doctors serving our people will be reduced still further.

In fact, the report of the President's Commission on the Health Needs of the Nation, made 3 years ago, stated that by 1960 the United States will need 30,000 additional physicians over and above the predicted supply for that year for reasonably comprehensive medical care to the whole civilian population, for the pressing needs of public-health services, industrial medicine, mental and tuberculosis staffs, faculties of medical schools and schools of public health, and to meet all the requirements of the Armed Forces.

The principal barrier to increasing the number of physicians is actually the limited capacity of our medical schools.

The Journal of the American Medical Association of September 11, 1954, states:

Medical schools indicate that large sums are still needed for construction of new buildings, remodeling and modernization of existing facilities, and the purchase and installment of new permanent equipment.

It is to help in meeting these basic needs, which loom so large in any consideration of the health and well-being of our people, that the proposed legislation to authorize Federal grants for construction of educational and research facilities for our medical schools is directed.

I believe this is a most constructive bill, and I am confident it will have serious and favorable consideration by Congress.

AMENDMENT OF CONSTITUTION RELATING TO ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. HUMPHREY. Mr. President, I introduce, for appropriate reference, a joint resolution proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the direct popular election of the President and Vice President. I ask unanimous consent that an explanatory statement prepared by me in connection with the resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The joint resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the explanatory statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The joint resolution (S. J. Res. 53) proposing an amendment to the Constitution of the United States providing for the direct popular election of President and Vice President, introduced by Mr. HUMPHREY, was received, read twice by its title, and referred to the Committee on the Judiciary.

The explanatory statement, presented by Mr. HUMPHREY, is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR HUMPHREY

For 160 years, the United States has been hampered by an obstacle in the path of democratic selection of the Chief Executives. The system has persisted in spite of oft-repeated efforts to substitute more rational and democratic methods. Now, in a time when democracy is enduring its severest trial before the peoples of the world, the United States must perform the duties which it has assumed, and lead the free nations of the world in demonstrating that democracy is the best way.

The fundamental principle on which any democracy is founded is that the people governed shall have a voice, a controlling voice in their government. This means that they shall elect their public servants by popular vote, so that the servants are responsible to the people in the most direct way possible. It is also inherent in any democracy that all citizens shall have an equal voice in choosing their public servants. It is inconsistent with our principles that the votes of some of our citizens are worth twice, 5 times, or 10 times as much as others, merely due to their geographic distribution. It is even more inconsistent that in every presidential election, millions of votes are not counted at all. These inconsistencies are difficult to justify in the eyes of the world. The United States should meet the challenge, and reform its outmoded election system in order that it may better reflect the will of the people.

The electoral college system has many defects. Not only is it possible for a man to be elected President of the United States even though more Americans may have voted for his opponent, but this has happened three times in the short history of our country. In 1824, Andrew Jackson polled 50,000 votes more than his nearest rival, John Quincy Adams, but lacked a majority due to the votes received by two other candidates. The election was thrown to the House of Representatives under the provisions of the Constitution. There, through pressure and influence, Adams was chosen to be President.

Again in 1876, Samuel J. Tilden received almost 265,000 votes more than Rutherford B. Hayes. Hayes won the election, however, through a vote in the electoral commission set up to decide the contest.

In 1888, Grover Cleveland received 375,000 votes more than Benjamin Harrison but lost to Harrison through the peculiar distribution of votes in the electoral college.

These three men, Adams, Hayes, and Harrison, were all defeated in the popular election, but nevertheless became President. More voters preferred another candidate in each instance, but due to our election arrangement, the also-ran became the Chief Executive. How can we justly say we believe in majority rule unless we correct the situation which allows this possibility?

There are three factors which contribute to the possibility of a President being chosen without receiving more votes than any other candidate. The first of these factors is that all the electoral votes of a State are cast for

the candidate that polls the greatest number of votes in the State. Thus, it makes no difference in the result of an election whether a candidate wins a State by a narrow margin or by a sweeping majority. The votes cast for the losing candidates in a State might just as well not have been cast at all. It is as if all the voters who did not vote for the winning candidate had been disfranchised. They might just as well have stayed at home. This may well be the cause of much apathy at election time in this country, particularly in the States which consistently vote one ticket year after year. There are an estimated 37 million people in the United States qualified to vote who do not choose to exercise this fundamental prerogative.

There are further statistics to show the unfortunate effects of the "all-or-nothing" rule, not as spectacular as electing the wrong President, but important nonetheless because they show that the electoral vote does not reflect the will of the people. In 1884, Cleveland received 563,084 popular votes in the State of New York and all of its electoral votes. In the same election, Blaine received 562,001 popular votes, only 1,083 fewer than Cleveland, but got none of the State's electoral votes. The electoral vote cast by the State seemed to indicate that New York was 100 percent behind Cleveland when in actuality, the margin between his support and Blaine's amounted to less than a tenth of a percent of the total vote cast.

In 1932, Herbert Hoover had 15,800,000 popular votes and of these, 13,600,000 brought no electoral votes due to their distribution among the States. Of Mr. Hoover's nearly 16 million votes, only 2 million were reflected in the electoral vote. In 1924, John W. Davis polled 6 million votes which were worthless to him for they brought no electoral votes, while 2 million other popular votes brought him 136 electoral votes. These 2 million votes were infinitely more valuable to Davis than the votes of 6 million other people who happened to be living in the wrong States to make their votes effective.

The second factor which contributes to the possibility of an also-ran becoming President of the United States is the fact that under the present electoral college system, each State is given a bonus of two electoral votes over the votes it has due to its population. There are 96 of these bonus votes distributed among the 48 States, and they give an unfair advantage to the voters who reside in the smaller States.

In 1950, the census showed the United States population to be 150,697,361. Thirty-eight States contained 70,453,399 people; the remaining 10 States contained 80,243,962 or 9,790,563 more than the 38 smaller States. But the 10 States have 20 automatic electoral votes while the 38 have 76 automatic votes. The 10 large States have over 6 million more people but 56 fewer electoral votes. The voters in the large States are penalized in that their votes don't count as much as those from the smaller States due to the two-vote bonus.

The third factor that contributes to the possibility that a President may be elected without having polled the most votes is the fact that a State casts the same number of electoral votes regardless of the number of people who turn out to vote. In the extreme case, a thousand people in New York could cast 47 electoral votes so long as no one else in the State bothered to vote. We don't have to go to the extreme case, however, to find extraordinary situations which actually existed. In the 1952 election, 1 electoral vote in Mississippi represented less than 36,000 popular votes due to the small election-day turnout, while in Minnesota 1 electoral vote represented more than 125,000 popular votes. The voter in Minnesota had less than one-third the importance in the final result as the voter in Mississippi. I am sure we all re-

vere and respect the Mississippi voter, but there are few among us, I think, who will maintain that his judgment concerning who should be President is more than three times as astute as that of the Minnesota or Massachusetts voter.

The following table represents other instances of unequal representation which have actually occurred:

In 1912 Wilson received 1 elector per 14,500 votes; Taft received 1 elector per 435,000 votes.

In 1928 Hoover received 1 elector per 48,180 votes; Smith received 1 elector per 172,602 votes.

In 1932 Hoover received 1 elector per 267,149 votes; Roosevelt received 1 elector per 48,351 votes.

In 1948 Truman received 1 elector per 78,123 votes; Dewey received 1 elector per 113,990 votes.

In 1952 Stevenson received 1 elector per 306,646 votes; Eisenhower received 1 elector per 76,764 votes.

The best way to eliminate the possibility that a man will be elected President in spite of the will of the people is to conduct a general popular election for the position. This does away with all the factors which might contribute to the election of a man who has lost the general election. Under the constitutional amendment which I am introducing today, every voter casts one vote, a whole vote, which is just as good and just as important as the vote cast by any other voter in the country. This is the democratic way. This is what we are trying to convince the people of the world to do. This is, in reality, what is implied in the spirit of our Government. This is the final step in the constitutional evolution which began with the declaration that all men are created equal, and continued with the assertion that no man or woman may be denied the right to vote for arbitrary reasons. Now we must make the suffrage an equal suffrage, and repudiate arbitrary and discriminatory geographical bases for denying or reducing the importance of the votes of some of our citizens.

The electoral college also permits the majority will within a State to be ignored. The best an individual member of the electoral college can do is perform a function which could more efficiently be performed without him. The worst he can do is to refuse to vote as instructed by the voters of his State and substitute his own will for theirs. In 1948, electors of four States repudiated the Democratic candidate and cast ballots for the States rights candidate. One elector out of eleven from a fifth State, Tennessee, did the same in spite of an overwhelming victory of the Democratic candidate over the States rights candidate in that State. The electors are not legally bound to follow the dictates of their State's electorate, and are free to exercise their discretion as they see fit.

In 1796 three electors disregarded the mandate of the general election, with the result that John Adams rather than Thomas Jefferson was elected.

A whole State's citizenry may be disfranchised by the action of a handful of men. The sooner this possibility is removed from our election procedures, the better for the American people.

From the voters' point of view, the electoral college only adds to the confusion of election day. The voter wants to vote for the President and Vice President, not for a list of electors whose names he doesn't recognize. Yet in 10 States, only the names of the electors appear on the ballot. In 16 other States, the ballot includes both the names of the candidates and of the electors.

Another reason for abolishing the electoral college is the possible confusion which would result if an elector is unable to carry out the function for which he was chosen. Suppose he dies, or fails to cast his vote on the proper

day and in the proper way. Or suppose the presidential candidate to whom he is pledged becomes ineligible and the elector is freed from his pledge. All of these circumstances have occurred in our history and all of them could have been avoided if the electoral college had been abolished.

Direct popular election of the President and Vice President are not new concepts in our political philosophy. The father of the Constitution, James Madison, strongly favored direct popular election. The man whose counsel and philosophy guided the creation of the Constitution, Benjamin Franklin, also supported this form of election. Andrew Jackson, one of the great Presidents of our history who was more closely in touch with the will of the people than most emphasized in his first message to Congress the need for direct popular election as a method of democratizing the election process. At best, the electoral college system is the result of a crude compromise, a matter of necessity in order to unite the States at the time of the constitutional convention. At worst, it is a device originally created to remove from the hands of the people the selection of the country's Chief Executive. Do we still believe that we must compromise on an issue so basic in a democracy? Do we still believe that the people are not to be trusted in choosing their President?

The answer to both of these questions is clear and it is "No." We have shown countless times that we recognize that the country is strong when the voice of the people is heard. We have removed restrictions on the suffrage three times by constitutional amendment, in amendments 14, 15, and 19. In reality, these amendments did not extend the suffrage; they merely recognized contradictions of democracy in our country and removed the contradictions.

We must now continue in the pattern set by our enlightened predecessors, in the tradition of democracy. We must support a direct election of the President and Vice President, recognizing that the present system is defective in guaranteeing the democratic equality of all voters, and that this anachronism must be eliminated.

The process of election as it exists today, promotes an unusual and unfortunate emphasis in presidential campaigning. In the first place, most candidates concentrate on winning majorities in a few large States, realizing that even if these majorities are very slight, they will carry with them all the electoral votes in the States. These large States contribute a disproportionate number of votes in the electoral college and for this reason the campaigns are disproportionately directed toward these States. The voters in the smaller States are neglected and must choose between the candidates on insufficient evidence. Proof of this campaign emphasis exists in the fact that 17 out of 27 major party candidates for the Presidency since 1900 came from Ohio or New York. In the past 50 years, we have had 3 Presidents from New York and 3 from Ohio. In the past 70 years, only twice has a President been elected without winning a majority in the State of New York.

I don't mean to detract from the caliber of the Presidents and candidates produced by New York and Ohio, and several of the other large States. However, I would venture to say that there have been other possible candidates from smaller States who weren't given the consideration that might have been due them because of their geographic position. On the other hand, citizens of the smaller States who are not the beneficiaries of vigorous campaigning are often apathetic about voting. We have a nonvoting population of 37 million, an extraordinarily large percentage for a free Republic.

Another factor in the peculiar emphases of our campaigns is the unusual importance of minority groups in large doubtful States. Often, Presidential candidates must give these groups far more consideration than is healthy in a democracy where the majority is supposed to rule. That minorities can exert an important influence is clearly shown in the election of 1948, when the Progressive Party polled enough votes to swing two important States to the Republican candidate. I use this example because it is one of the few cases where the effect of the vote of a political minority group can be accurately shown. It is more difficult to study the voting patterns of other minority groups because under the secret ballot these votes cannot be separated in the final election returns. However, there is no doubt that certain minority groups receive special treatment in Presidential campaigns, and we can be sure that this is not without good reason.

A direct Presidential election is needed, then, for many reasons, but all of the reasons are derived from the principle that all votes cast should have equal importance in deciding who is to be President. This principle is basic in our democracy as well as in any other democracy. It means not only that all the votes cast will have the same mathematical importance, but that all votes will be the end product of virtually the same opportunity of choice, as far as possible.

It is our duty to the world as well as to our citizens to perfect our form of democracy until it is beyond the criticism of principle without execution. We must be the example to the free world not only in our words and ideas, but in our actions and our conduct. We must mean what we say when we dedicate ourselves to a government in which its strength, integrity, and sovereignty are those of its people, as expressed in free, untrammelled elections.

ANNUAL CONSOLIDATED GENERAL APPROPRIATION BILL

Mr. BYRD. Mr. President, on behalf of myself, the Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], the Senator from New Mexico [Mr. ANDERSON], the Senator from Wyoming [Mr. BARRETT], the junior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BENDER], the Senator from Utah [Mr. BENNETT], the junior Senator from Nevada [Mr. BRIBLE], the senior Senator from Ohio [Mr. BRICKER], the Senator from New Hampshire [Mr. BRIDGES], the senior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. BUSH], the Senator from Maryland [Mr. BUTLER], the senior Senator from Indiana [Mr. CAPEHART], the junior Senator from Kansas [Mr. CARLSON], the junior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. CURTIS], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the junior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN], the senior Senator from Illinois [Mr. DOUGLAS], the junior Senator from Pennsylvania [Mr. DUFF], the senior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. ERVIN], the Senator from Vermont [Mr. FLANDERS], the Senator from Arizona [Mr. GOLDWATER], the senior Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNINGS], the Senator from Iowa [Mr. HICKENLOOPER], the senior Senator from Nebraska [Mr. HRUSKA], the Senator from New York [Mr. IVES], the junior Senator from Indiana [Mr. JENNER], the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER], the junior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. KENNEDY], the Senator from California [Mr. KUCHEL], the senior Senator from Nevada [Mr. MALONE], the senior Senator

from Pennsylvania [Mr. MARTIN], the Senator from Wisconsin [Mr. MCCARTHY], the Senator from South Dakota [Mr. MUNDT], the junior Senator from Maine [Mr. PAYNE], the junior Senator from Connecticut [Mr. PURTELL], my colleague the junior Senator from Virginia [Mr. ROBERTSON], the senior Senator from Massachusetts [Mr. SALTONSTALL], the senior Senator from Kansas [Mr. SCHOEPEL], the junior Senator from North Carolina [Mr. SCOTT], the senior Senator from Maine [Mrs. SMITH], the Senator from New Jersey [Mr. SMITH], the junior Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON], the Senator from South Carolina [Mr. THURMOND], the Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], the Senator from Idaho [Mr. WELKER], and the Senator from Delaware [Mr. WILLIAMS], I submit, for appropriate reference, a concurrent resolution providing for annual consolidated appropriation bills. I ask unanimous consent that a statement prepared by me in connection with the concurrent resolution be printed in the RECORD.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The concurrent resolution will be received and appropriately referred; and, without objection, the statement will be printed in the RECORD.

The concurrent resolution (S. Con. Res. 15), submitted by Mr. BYRD (for himself and other Senators), was received and referred to the Committee on Rules and Administration, as follows:

Resolved by the Senate (the House of Representatives concurring). That effective on the first day of the second regular session of the 84th Congress, the joint rule of the Senate and of the House of Representatives contained in section 138 of the Legislative Reorganization Act of 1946 is amended by adding at the end thereof the following new subsections:

"(c) (1) All appropriations for each fiscal year shall be consolidated in one general appropriation bill to be known as the Consolidated General Appropriation Act of — (the blank to be filled in with the appropriate fiscal year). The consolidated general appropriation bill may be divided into separate titles, each title corresponding so far as practicable to the respective regular general appropriation bills heretofore enacted. As used in this paragraph, the term 'appropriations' shall not include deficiency or supplemental appropriations, appropriations under private acts of Congress, or rescissions of appropriations.

"(2) The consolidated general appropriation bill for each fiscal year, and each deficiency and supplemental general appropriation bill containing appropriations available for obligation during such fiscal year, shall contain provisions limiting the net amount to be obligated during such fiscal year in the case of each appropriation made therein which is available for obligation beyond the close of such fiscal year. Such consolidated general appropriation bill shall also contain provisions limiting the net amounts to be obligated during such fiscal year from all other prior appropriations which are available for obligation beyond the close of such fiscal year. Each such general appropriation bill shall also contain a provision that the limitations required by this paragraph shall not be construed to prohibit the incurring of an obligation in the form of a contract within the respective amounts appropriated or otherwise authorized by law, if such con-

tract does not provide for the delivery of property or the rendition of services during such fiscal year in excess of the applicable limitations on obligations. The foregoing provisions of this paragraph shall not be applicable to appropriations made specifically for the payment of claims certified by the Comptroller General of the United States and of judgments, to amounts appropriated under private acts of Congress, to appropriations for the payment of interest on the public debt, or to revolving funds or appropriations thereto.

"(3) The committee reports accompanying each consolidated general appropriation bill, and conference report thereon, shall show in tabular form, for information purposes, by items and totals—

"(A) the amount of each appropriation or other budgetary authorization for expenditure including estimates of amounts becoming available in the fiscal year under permanent appropriations;

"(B) estimates of the balances of appropriations and other budgetary authorizations for expenditure as of the beginning of the fiscal year, other than the obligated balances of expired appropriations;

"(C) estimates of the net amount to be expended in the fiscal year from each appropriation or other budgetary authorization for expenditure referred to in clause (A);

"(D) estimates of the net amount to be expended in the fiscal year from the balances of appropriations and other budgetary authorizations for expenditure referred to in clause (B);

"(E) estimates of the net amount to be expended in the fiscal year from revolving and management funds, other than expenditures referred to in clauses (C) and (D);

"(F) the totals of the amounts referred to in clauses (C), (D), and (E); and

"(G) estimates of the total amount which will be available for expenditure subsequent to the close of the fiscal year from the appropriations and other budgetary authorizations for expenditure referred to in clause (A).

The committee reports accompanying each deficiency and supplemental appropriation bill containing appropriations available for obligation or expenditure during the fiscal year, and each appropriation rescission bill, and any conference report on any such bill, shall include appropriate cumulative revisions of such tabulations.

"(4) The information reported under paragraph (3) shall be accompanied by (i) data on revolving and management funds (including the funds of wholly owned Government corporations) which shall show the gross amounts from which the net amounts estimated to be expended are derived, and information on estimated investments, repayment of capital, payment of dividends, and other cash transactions which do not affect net expenditures; and (ii) such supplemental data as may be considered desirable by the committee making the report.

"(5) The provisions of paragraphs (2), (3), and (4) shall not be applicable to appropriations of trust funds or to transactions involving public-debt retirement.

"(6) No general appropriation bill shall be received or considered in either House unless the bill and the report accompanying it conform with this rule.

"(7) The Appropriations Committees of the two Houses may hold hearings simultaneously on each general appropriation bill or may hold joint hearings thereon.

"(d) The consolidated general appropriation bill for each fiscal year, and each deficiency and supplemental general appropriation bill containing appropriations available for obligation during such fiscal year, shall at the time the bill is reported to the House of Representatives and to the Senate

contain in the body of the bill or in a preamble thereto, as the respective committees may deem appropriate, a current estimate of the Secretary of the Treasury of the overall Federal receipts for such fiscal year."

The statement presented by Mr. BYRD is as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR BYRD

Forty-six Members of the Senate today joined in the introduction of a bill to establish procedures by which Congress could regain control of annual obligations for Federal expenditure.

This approach to the recapture of fiscal control would be accomplished by provisions in the bill under which Congress annually would fix limitations on obligations for expenditure by Federal agencies from balances they have built up in appropriations previously enacted for them as well as obligations against new authorizations in current appropriation bills.

The importance of expenditures from balances in old appropriations, over which Congress has been exercising virtually no control, is emphasized by the following facts to be found in the Federal Budget Document of January 17:

1. The President estimated expenditures in the next fiscal year, beginning July 1, at \$62.4 billion.

2. The President estimated that, of the \$62.4 billion total expenditures, only \$37.9 billion will be from the \$58.6 billion he requested in new appropriations and other authorizations to be enacted this year.

3. The President estimated that \$24.5 billion of the total expenditures will be from the \$82 billion in balances of old appropriations and other authorizations, enacted in previous years, which are to be carried over into the new year.

Under present practices, Congress ordinarily acts only on new appropriations requested, without exercising control over expenditures from balances in old appropriations which are to be carried over.

To attempt to balance the budget by action only on that part of new appropriations for expenditure in the coming year would require excessively heavy reductions on half of the expenditure budget, while that part to be spent from old appropriations would be largely exempt even from review for reduction.

Sponsors of this bill do not claim it is the complete solution to the tail-wagging-the-dog situation created by uncontrolled expenditure from tremendous carryover balances, but, among other reforms in fiscal legislative procedure, it is largely directed at this problem.

Provisions of the bill may be divided generally into three parts:

1. They would provide that Congress consider all appropriations in one package, instead of a dozen scattered, unrelated bills as at present, so Members and the public can see the whole picture as the spending side of the budget is enacted.

(The so-called single appropriation bill of 1950 merely collected all of the regular appropriations between two covers of the bill, and that was as far as its similarity to this proposal went.)

2. They would provide that Congress shall write into the appropriation bill, against all items involved, limitations on annual obligations for expenditure from all appropriations—those previously enacted as well as those currently under consideration.

(The importance of provisions in this category may be seen from the fact that as of next June 30 the build-up of unexpended balances in old appropriations and authorizations will exceed \$80 billion. While a large part of this total will be called "obligated," the validity of some of the so-called obliga-

tions should be subject to scrutiny in review.)

(It should be noted also that it is annual expenditure—not annual appropriations—against annual revenue which result in annual deficits or surpluses; and that it is annual deficits which pile up public debt.)

3. They would provide also that committee reports on appropriation bills shall show annual expenditure estimates which could be compared with revenue estimates, and that revised revenue estimates shall be requested from the Treasury from time to time during the consideration of the bill, so that the budget may be kept in balance during the process of appropriation bill enactment.

The language of this bill is practically identical with that of Senate Concurrent Resolution 8 of the past session of Congress, frequently referred to as the "single appropriation bill."

This bill originally was drafted in 1947 when it first became evident that, even under peacetime conditions, Congress was losing annual control over Federal expenditures.

The bill is designed to recapture a measure of that control, through its obligation limitation features, and at the same time provision would be made for necessary long-term contracts such as those required for heavy and intricate military equipment.

The language of the bill has been carefully worked over by fiscal experts and drafting technicians, and it has been approved four times by the Senate Rules Committee, twice with a Republican majority, and twice with a Democratic majority. It has been passed twice by the Senate as a whole.

EXTENSION OF TRADE AGREEMENTS ACT—AMENDMENT

Mr. CAPEHART submitted an amendment, intended to be proposed by him to the bill (H. R. 1) to extend the authority of the President to enter into trade agreements under section 350 of the Tariff Act of 1930, as amended, and for other purposes, which was referred to the Committee on Finance, and ordered to be printed.

ADDRESSES, EDITORIALS, ARTICLES, ETC., PRINTED IN THE RECORD

On request, and by unanimous consent, addresses, editorials, articles, etc., were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

By Mr. HILL:

Address entitled "Education: Democracy's Indispensable Weapon," delivered by him before the convention of the American Association of School Administrators, at St. Louis, Mo., on February 28, 1955.

By Mr. KEFAUVER:

Address delivered by him before the Rotary Club of Memphis, Tenn., on Tuesday, March 1, 1955.

By Mr. WILEY:

Address delivered by him at Stephens College, Missouri, on February 22, 1955.

By Mr. CURTIS:

Statement prepared by him entitled "The Republican Valley Conservation Association."

By Mr. CARLSON:

Address entitled "Peace Through Power," delivered by the Assistant Secretary of Defense Fred A. Seaton at Kansas State College, Manhattan, Kans., February 9, 1955.

By Mr. CAPEHART:

Statement in commemoration of centenary of St. Mary's College, near South Bend, Ind.

NOTICE OF HEARING ON SENATE JOINT RESOLUTIONS 3, 9, 10, 27, 30, AND 31, PROPOSING AMENDMENTS TO THE CONSTITUTION RELATIVE TO THE ELECTION OF PRESIDENT AND VICE PRESIDENT

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on behalf of the Standing Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Wednesday, March 16, 1955, beginning at 10 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on Senate Joint Resolution 3, Senate Joint Resolution 9, Senate Joint Resolution 10, Senate Joint Resolution 27, Senate Joint Resolution 30, and Senate Joint Resolution 31, resolutions proposing an amendment to the Constitution relative to the election of President and Vice President. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in this legislation may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman, the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING], the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL], the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER], and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

NOTICE OF HEARING ON SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION 8, TO AMEND THE CONSTITUTION TO AUTHORIZE GOVERNORS TO FILL TEMPORARY VACANCIES IN THE CONGRESS CAUSED BY A DISASTER

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, on behalf of the standing Subcommittee on Constitutional Amendments of the Committee on the Judiciary, I desire to give notice that a public hearing has been scheduled for Tuesday, March 15, 1955, at 10:30 a. m., in room 424, Senate Office Building, on Senate Joint Resolution 8, a resolution to amend the Constitution to authorize governors to fill temporary vacancies in the Congress caused by a disaster. At the indicated time and place all persons interested in the proposed legislation may make such representations as may be pertinent. The subcommittee consists of myself, chairman; the Senator from Missouri [Mr. HENNING]; the Senator from Texas [Mr. DANIEL]; the Senator from North Dakota [Mr. LANGER]; and the Senator from Illinois [Mr. DIRKSEN].

NOTICE OF HEARINGS ON CERTAIN NOMINATIONS BY COMMITTEE ON FOREIGN RELATIONS

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. As a Senator and chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, the Chair desires to say that the Senate received today the nomination of William A. Kimbel, of South Carolina, to be the representative of the United States of America to the Tenth Session of the Economic Commission for Europe of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations. Notice is hereby given that this nomination will be considered by the Committee on

Foreign Relations at the expiration of 6 days, in accordance with the committee rule.

The Senate also received today the nomination of Kingsley Davis, of New York, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Population Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term of 3 years expiring December 31, 1957. Notice is also given that this nomination will be considered by the Committee on Foreign Relations at the expiration of 6 days, in accordance with the committee rule.

NINETEEN HUNDRED AND FIFTY-FOUR AWARDS OF FREEDOM'S FOUNDATION

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I know that the Congress read with pleasure on Saturday, February 20, the news from historic Valley Forge, Pa., of the 1954 Freedom's Awards, made by the Freedom's Foundation.

This distinguished foundation has given tremendous new impetus to patriotic observance and rededication throughout our country.

I have prepared a statement on this subject, and ask unanimous consent that it be printed at this point in the body of the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY SENATOR WILEY

Under its charter, Freedom's Foundation at Valley Forge exists for the following purpose:

"To create and build an understanding of the spirit and philosophy of the Constitution and Bill of Rights and of our indivisible bundle of political and economic freedoms inherent in them.

"To inspire love of freedom and to support the spiritual unity born of the belief that man is a dignified human being, created in the image of his Maker, and by that fact possessor of certain inalienable rights."

NOTABLE OFFICERS, TRUSTEES, AND DIRECTORS

The distinguished officers, trustees, and board of directors of the foundation indicate the high caliber of this great organization. I should like now to list these outstanding individuals:

FREEDOM'S FOUNDATION AT VALLEY FORGE

Honorary Officers

Hon. Dwight D. Eisenhower, honorary chairman; Hon. Herbert Hoover, honorary president.

Officers and Trustees

Kenneth D. Wells, president and trustee; Don Belding, chairman of directors and trustee; Charles E. White, trustee; Fred Maytag II, trustee; William C. McCord, treasurer and trustee.

Board of Directors

Kenneth W. Akers, Cleveland, Ohio; Dr. Raymond B. Allen, Los Angeles, Calif.; George D. Bailey, Detroit, Mich.; Mrs. Olive Ann Beech, Wichita, Kans.; Don Belding, Los Angeles, Calif.; Mrs. Lewis H. Brown, New York; Erwin D. Canhan, Boston, Mass.; Colby M. Chester, New York; Paul Foster Clark, Boston, Mass.; William Robertson Coe, New York; James Cope, Detroit, Mich.; James W. Cotheran, Bishopville, S. C.; Nathan L. Dauby, Cleveland, Ohio; Edward M. Dealey, Dallas, Tex.; George S. Dinwiddie, New Or-

leans, La.; Dr. Milton S. Eisenhower, State College, Pa.; Dr. Fred D. Fagg, Los Angeles, Calif.; Adrien Falk, San Francisco, Calif.; Hon. James A. Farley, New York; Walter D. Fuller, Philadelphia, Pa.

Fred G. Gurley, Chicago, Ill.; Dr. John Robbins Hart, Valley Forge; Maj. Gen. Harlan N. Hartness, Ophelia, Va.; Hon. Charles R. Hayes, Deadwood, S. Dak.; Rev. Theodore M. Hesburgh, C. S. C., Notre Dame, Ind.; Conrad N. Hilton, Beverly Hills, Calif.; Mrs. Clifford F. Hood, Pittsburgh, Pa.; Edward F. Hutton, New York; Dr. Raymond E. Jackson, Buffalo, N. Y.; Dr. Albert C. Jacobs, Hartford, Conn.; Dr. Robert L. Johnson, Philadelphia, Pa.; Dr. Clarence A. Manion, Chicago, Ill.; Fred Maytag II, Newton, Iowa; Dr. Kevin McCann, Defiance, Ohio; William C. McCord, Detroit, Mich.; Rt. Rev. Msgr. John S. Middleton, New York; Thomas E. Millsop, Weirton, W. Va.; Clint W. Murchison, Dallas, Tex.; John P. Murphy, Cleveland, Ohio; Graham Patterson, Philadelphia, Pa.

Mrs. James B. Patton, Columbus, Ohio; Mrs. J. Howard Pew, Ardmore, Pa.; Henning W. Prentiss, Jr., Lancaster, Pa.; Sld. W. Richardson, Fort Worth, Tex.; Jackie Robinson, New York; Miss Ginger Rogers, Beverly Hills, Calif.; Hon. George Rossman, Salem, Oreg.; Dr. Guy M. Rush, Los Angeles, Calif.; Dr. Norman Salt, New York; Alfred P. Sloan, Jr., New York; Herbert E. Smith, New York; Faustin J. Solon, Toledo, Ohio; Dr. Harold E. Stassen, Washington; Arthur W. Steudel, Cleveland, Ohio; Reese H. Taylor, Los Angeles, Calif.; Hon. William Glenn Terrell, Tallahassee, Fla.; Mrs. Robert A. Vogeler, Bedford Hills, N. Y.; Kenneth D. Wells, Valley Forge; Hon. Carl V. Weygant, Columbus, Ohio; Charles M. White, Cleveland, Ohio.

SOME OF THE TOP AWARDS

The awards themselves were numerous. Their very comprehensiveness indicates how clearly the foundation's guiding hands have understood that the challenge to America must be met in every field of endeavor, in every media of communication, in every phase of American society—religion, education, business, labor, civic activity, and many others.

While I cannot, of course, attempt to list all of the awards, I should like to mention just a few highlights of them without in any way detracting from all the other groups and individuals who were honored by other prizes.

SPLENDID AWARDS JURY

I may say that these annual awards are a highlight each year of patriotic American's admiration of noble contributions to the cause of service of country.

I have been pleased to be in contact down through the years with Mr. W. C. "Tom" Sawyer, vice president in charge of the national awards program and former director of the Americanism division of the American Legion.

I am happy to note that the 1954 national and school awards jury represented as usual a cross-section of outstanding American organizations and individuals. Among them, I am glad to say was a notable jurist of my own State, member of the Supreme Court of Wisconsin, the Honorable Roland J. Steinle.

The list of the awards jury now follows:

THE DISTINGUISHED 1954 NATIONAL AND SCHOOL AWARDS JURY OF FREEDOM'S FOUNDATION AT VALLEY FORGE

Chairman: Dr. George D. Humphrey, president, the University of Wyoming.

Coordinator: Hon. Charles R. Hayes, retired presiding judge, Supreme Court of South Dakota.

Col. Walter C. Bowman, national commander, Military Order of the Purple Heart.

Mrs. Theodore S. Chapman, president, General Federation of Women's Clubs.

Mr. Thomas J. Cuite, national commander, Catholic War Veterans of the U. S. A.

Col. William B. Freeland, member, National Council, Reserve Officers Association of the United States, Inc.

Hon. Frederick G. Hamley, Chief Justice elect, Supreme Court of Washington.

Hon. W. W. Harvey, Chief Justice, Supreme Court of Kansas.

Hon. W. Marion Hendry, past national commander, Coast Guard League.

Mrs. Mae Holmes, national commander, Disabled American Veterans Auxiliary.

Mrs. Thomas F. Holz, national president, Ladies Auxiliary to the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the U. S.

Hon. Ernest A. Inglis, Chief Justice, Connecticut Supreme Court of Errors.

Mrs. Pauline M. Kelly, national commander, Navy Mothers' Clubs of America.

Miss Bertha M. Luckey, president, Quota Club International.

Mr. Tag Manning, first vice president, 20-30 International.

Hon. James Morris, Chief Justice, Supreme Court of North Dakota.

Mr. Nicholas C. Mueller, international vice president, Optimist International.

Hon. M. T. Phelps, Chief Justice, Supreme Court of Arizona.

Mr. Jay A. Pound, national president, American War Dads, Inc.

Dr. Dorothea F. Radusch, international president, Zonta International.

Dr. Carl J. Rees, vice commander, the American Legion.

Mr. George K. Shamgochian, national commandant, Marine Corps League.

Hon. Roland J. Steinle, Justice, Supreme Court of Wisconsin.

Mrs. Sara E. Stone, national president, National Ladies Auxiliary, Jewish War Veterans of the U. S.

Mrs. Louise Tegeler, national vice counselor, Daughters of America.

Mr. Lloyd Thurston, commander, United Spanish War Veterans.

Hon. Walter L. Toozee, Acting Chief Justice, Supreme Court of Oregon.

Hon. Frank L. Wilkinson, general president, the General Society, Sons of the Revolution.

Mr. R. Clarence Williams, president-elect, Civitan International.

Here then are a few of the fine awards:

A special award went to Rev. Billy Graham for his famed evangelistic efforts, and to St. John's University, whose faculty group has written the volume *Concept of Freedom*.

Top general awards went to the All-American Conference to Combat Communism (composed of America's leading fraternal, veterans, womens, patriotic, civic, religious, and other groups) for the AAC's Know Your America Week program; to the Hawaiian Residents' Association, Inc., for its three-fold program of combating communism, promoting racial harmony, and demonstrating and maintaining the American way of life; and to Kiwanis International for its Minutemen for Americanism program.

Top magazine article award went to Henry Lee, of Stamford, Conn., and of the New York Daily News, for his memorable article in Collier's magazine entitled "Our Lives, Our Fortune, and Our Sacred Honor." The article depicted the ultimate fate of the patriots who risked everything in their signing of the Declaration of Independence.

Top award in 16-millimeter motion pictures went to the Chamber of Commerce of the United States for its splendid film, *It's Everybody's Business*.

Top television award went to America's electric light and power companies for one

of the programs in their highly esteemed CBS series, *You Are There*. This program, *Resolve of Patrick Henry*, reenacted the scene on March 23, 1775, when the indomitable Patrick Henry led the gallant sons of Virginia in taking their stand on behalf of separation from the crown.

WISCONSIN WINNERS

We, of Wisconsin, are pleased to note the numerous winners from our own State, and I should like now to include the text of an article which appeared in the February 20 Milwaukee Journal listing the seven Wisconsin award recipients:

"FREEDOM AWARDS TO SEVEN IN STATE

"Mrs. Florence V. Beadle of 3057 N. Sherman Blvd., was one of seven Wisconsin residents who won 1954 Freedom awards, the Freedoms Foundation announced Saturday at Valley Forge, Pa. Eight Wisconsin companies, schools, and corporations also were honored.

"Mrs. Beadle won an honor certificate award for her work as editor of the Geuder, Paeschke & Frey Co. publication, *As We See It*. Her company also won an honor certificate.

"Other Wisconsin award winners:

"George B. Thacher, Madison, honor award certificate for work as editor of Wisconsin Power & Light Co. publication. The company also won an honor certificate.

"Rita Middleton, Germantown, second place award for untitled essay, \$50 and George Washington medal; Kaukauna High School, honor award certificate; Wisconsin department, American Legion, George Washington medal award for community programs; Rodney Jonathan Crook, Mineral Point, second place in general category, \$50 and George Washington medal; Laboratory School, Platteville State College, George Washington medal.

"Elaine M. Kitto, Racine, honor certificate award for work as editor of Belle City Malleable Iron Co. publication. The company also won an honor certificate.

"William Johnson, Racine, honor certificate award for work as editor of J. I. Case Co. publication. The company won the same award.

"The Reverend Edwin Jaster, Racine, George Washington honor medal for 16-millimeter motion picture, *An Adventure in Freedom*, and Waupaca city schools, George Washington medal.

"The foundation also announced a series of awards, totaling \$20,000, for college journalism students. There will be 100 awards of \$100 each and 20 fellowship awards of \$500 each. Students aiming at a career in journalism will be invited to submit two papers for judging by the Freedoms Foundation. The first will be a monograph on the American way of life, the second an editorial on some facet of the American way of life."

CONCLUSION

To all the individuals who were honored by awards, as well as to those whose efforts were considered but did not receive a prize, I want to convey best wishes for their patriotic resolve.

And I want to renew my greetings to all the participants in the work of Freedom's Foundation.

They are carrying on today the noble traditions which were first established by George Washington and his valiant soldiers of the Continental Army in the dark days of 1777-78, when the very life of America hung in the balance.

Today, once more, the same type of dedication is necessary in the face of a challenge even greater to our own country and to the world—the challenge of aggressive, atheistic, international communism.

Just as the enemies of America would like to assault us from abroad and to try to divide us at home by their alien propaganda in every segment of society, so the protectors of America, the sustainers of America, the guardians of America, must protect us to the limit of their ability in every sphere. They must encourage eternal vigilance, must generate right thinking and right action, promote the brotherhood of man and faith in the Fatherhood of God.

FIFTIETH ANNIVERSARY OF JOURNALISM SCHOOL OF UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, last Saturday in Madison, Wis., there occurred a memorable dinner marking the 50th anniversary of journalism teaching at the University of Wisconsin. The dinner climaxed a 2-day golden anniversary program, which included seminars on news reporting, circulation, and advertising. The program honored what is generally regarded as the oldest continuously operated school of journalism in American higher education.

There were many scoffers and skeptics when the late Dr. Willard Grosvenor Bleyer opened the first journalism class in the fall of 1905. Many outstanding leaders in journalism of that day scoffed at the idea that journalism could be taught in school; they insisted it had to be taught in a city room, or on the police beat, or only in other actual practice.

But in the half century which has followed, the teaching of journalism has become an indispensable segment of the American fourth estate, and of higher education as well.

The 50th anniversary dinner at Madison heard a significant address on the subject of Secrecy in Government delivered by the noted newspaper columnist, an alumnus of the university's school of journalism, Mr. Marquis Childs. Mr. Childs, a 1923 graduate, was 1 of 6 alumni who received citations for distinguished achievement. The citations were presented by the university president, E. B. Fred.

Others who received the awards were: Irwin Maier, publisher of the Milwaukee Journal; Lloyd Lehrbas, Assistant to the Secretary of the Army; Kenneth W. Payne, executive editor of the Reader's Digest; Louis P. Lochner, author and former foreign correspondent; and Walter Seiler, president of Cramer-Krasselt Co., Milwaukee advertising agency.

I desire to convey to the faculty and students of the school of journalism my warmest wishes and, in particular, to the editors and staff of the *Daily Cardinal*, my special greetings for their actual demonstration, famed throughout the Nation, of modern university journalism.

May the next 50 years be as rich with achievement as the past 50 have been for this great school, and may the American fourth estate continue to prosper as one of the great sentinels of American freedom and a vital check and balance in the American process.

THE FORMOSA SITUATION

Mr. LEHMAN. Mr. President, like most of the people of our country and many of our friends abroad, I continue to be deeply concerned with regard to the Formosa situation. I have made my views and my fears clear in several speeches in the Senate when the Formosa resolution and the treaty with Chiang Kai-shek were before us. For the reasons set forth in my remarks, I voted against both the resolution and the treaty.

The situation is so explosive and dangerous that it should, and must, continue to engage the attention and study of all our people. Unfortunately, however, our people have so little knowledge of what our policy actually is that they are thoroughly confused and greatly disturbed. Last Tuesday night I listened to a telecast on the Edward R. Murrow See It Now program. It was an interview with Chiang Kai-shek, by our colleague the senior Senator from Maine. General Chiang Kai-shek made it completely clear that the aim of this country and that of Chiang Kai-shek were in wide divergence. Our announced policy is to defend Formosa and the Pescadores Islands. Chiang's intention, which he again announced is to seize and return to the mainland of China. I do not believe that these conflicting aims can be reconciled without our courting serious danger, and possibly disaster.

I ask unanimous consent to have printed at this point in the body of the Record, as a part of my remarks, an article, written by the distinguished columnist and author, Joseph Alsop, entitled "The Fix We're In," and an editorial, which appeared in the Washington Post and Times Herald on February 26, entitled "What's Clear About It?" The article and the editorial are thoughtful and highly important analyses of the dangerous situation which we are confronted. I commend them to the careful reading and study of the Members of the Senate and of the people of the country generally.

There being no objection, the article and editorial were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

[From the New York Herald Tribune of February 25, 1955]

THE FIX WE'RE IN

(By Joseph Alsop)

TAIPEI, FORMOSA.—It is high time for people at home to face the full seriousness of the fix we are in out here in Asia. The leaders of world communism are now conducting an elaborate nerve war on the Formosa issue. It may be the prelude to a decisive showdown. Or it may only be intended to put the courage of the members of the Western Alliance to an acid test.

Either way, the danger to the United States is incalculably great. For the Eisenhower administration's foreign and defense policies have painted the United States into an almost inescapable corner in Asia.

For 2 years, Washington has paid no attention to the prejudices that hagride the Formosa issue in Britain and Western Europe. Only last week, Secretary Dulles' important speech received the usual acknowledgments—jubilation from Senator KNOWLAND and doleful cries from London.

Even now, no serious effort is being made to form a united front in Asia with our allies. Thus the Communist nerve war has an excellent chance of isolating America on the issue of this controversial island.

This would not be so disturbing, if the Eisenhower administration had ever bothered to match its bold talk with an equally bold defense policy. From Korea onward, there has been a good case for going it alone to halt Communist aggression in Asia. But going it alone costs a lot of money for defense; and our defense policy has been made in the Treasury Department.

The result of simultaneous efforts to please Senator KNOWLAND and Secretary of the Treasury Humphrey is the fix we are in. The key to that fix, well known to the world Communist leaders but concealed from our own people, is the present status of the American Strategic Air Command.

Our main weapon and almost our only offensive weapon squarely depends upon its trans-Atlantic bases. The Strategic Air Command's trans-Atlantic bases are controlled, not by us, but by our allies. If our allies part from us over Formosa, the bases will be denied to SAC. And if the bases are denied, SAC will still be able to fight, but SAC will be unable to strike the immediate, decisive blow that it is SAC's vital job to strike.

In fact you can express the practical effects of the successful isolation of America in a crude equation. It equals denial of the trans-Atlantic bases which equals the destruction of about half of General LeMay's airplanes before the shooting even starts.

Consider the shock, if the news came over the radio that half the great SAC force had just been destroyed by saboteurs. Imagine how the country would then feel about a final show-down with Red China and the Soviet Union. And despite the loud denials that will be heard from the Defense Department, remember that this will approximate the real situation if the Communists win their nerve war.

These are the points that must be borne in mind, in weighing the present crisis. It is certainly conceivable that the Communist leaders seriously want a final show-down on Formosa, if they can just contrive to isolate America and thus to bend and blunt our main weapon.

Molotov's grim speech seemed to say as much. German rearmament provides a possible motive. And if the masters of the Kremlin really prefer fighting America to seeing Germany rearm, the ideal place to start the war is here in Asia, where there is such a gaping hole in the Western Alliance.

It is much more likely that the Communist leaders mean to carry their nerve war only as far as the nerve-shattering brink of final catastrophe. Even so, as matters stand now, they will still have a good chance of isolating America. And how will President Eisenhower choose, when he is not quite sure the enemy is really bluffing, and he has to make the choice between backing down on Formosa or risking a big war with his main weapon half broken in his hand?

There would be no need to ask such questions if we had pursued a different defense policy. But the only course now open is to take out disunity insurance. Let the American Government, then, make a little speech to the British Government:

"We will not abandon Formosa, because Formosa is strategically vital and such a surrender would bring the loss of all of Asia in its train. But if you can get a cease-fire down the middle of the Formosa Strait in exchange for Quemoy and the Matsus, we will back you all the way. You have carte blanche to make a trade. On the other hand,

if you cannot make a trade, we think it means the enemy intends to fight anyway. Then we see no reason to give away the offshore islands. And we hope you will back us."

This would outrage Senator KNOWLAND, not to mention the same newspapers and magazines which have professed to see perfection in the defense policy that has put us in our present fix. But it would also get us out of the fix. For such a gesture would give Prime Minister Churchill and Foreign Secretary Eden just the help they need in their rather courageous efforts to cope with British public opinion. It would almost certainly prevent the isolation which is now the great danger. And in the end, even those who dislike the cease-fire idea would probably be happy. For there is no reason to suppose that the terms which would restore Western unity would be accepted by the Communists.

[From the Washington Post and Times Herald of February 26, 1955]

WHAT'S CLEAR ABOUT IT?

The frequency with which the Chinese Communists are warning sundry diplomats in Peking that they intend to invade Formosa has all the earmarks of a war of nerves. If the threat is a bluff, it is a rather foolish one; for either the Communists will have to produce or they will have to acknowledge that it is a bluff and thereby lose face. Most observers seem to feel that the Communists do not want a conflict in advance of the Afro-Asian conference in April. It is, of course, more than possible that what they have in mind is a subversive coup on Formosa stimulated by propaganda and intimidation—a problem that was not contemplated in the Formosa defense pact.

Admiral Radford says flatly in an interview in U. S. News & World Report that the Chinese "do not have the military capability" to carry out a successful invasion of Formosa at this time. This judgment would be more convincing if it were not accompanied, in the same interview, by a lot of misleading gloss about the relationship of the Joint Chiefs of Staff to other aspects of national policy—particularly the proposed intervention at Dien Bien Phu last spring. Let us hope that Admiral Radford's estimate of the Chinese capabilities is right. Even if the Chinese do not mean what they say about Formosa, however, this does not rule out an attack on the Quemoy and Matsus that could lead to larger war.

In the event of an attack on Formosa, the United States probably could count on at least the moral support, and perhaps some physical support, from the western allies. Prime Minister Churchill intimated as much the other day at the same time that he made clear Britain's disagreement with the American position respecting the Quemoy and Matsus. These islands are the immediate problem. What will the United States do in the event of a Communist attack on these coastal outposts?

The Quemoy and Matsus have none of the collective guarantees of the SEATO pact, which the conferees at Bangkok seem to have made some solid progress in defining. The islands are, in fact, only obliquely related to the defense of Formosa, and they are poor places to fight. Unhappily, the administration has maneuvered itself into a position in which, it seems to us, it will have to defend the Quemoy and Matsus. The alternative now would be to weaken whatever determination there is in the free world to prevent a forcible Communist takeover of Formosa, and to deal an extremely serious blow to American prestige.

This predicament stems directly from the attempt of the administration to carry

water on both shoulders—to buy off Senator KNOWLAND and guarantee Chiang Kai-shek's morale at the same time it was trying to effectuate a basic change of policy. Evidently administration spokesmen have been telling different stories to different audiences about the coastal islands; and Chairman RICHARDS, of the House Foreign Affairs Committee, is justified in questioning the ambiguity. Far from being a precise statement of American intentions, the much-touted clarification of policy has turned out to be exactly the opposite. Congress and the American public, as well as the Communists, have been left in the dark.

Hindsight, however, will not extricate us. The best course now seems to be to rely on the British and our other friends to clarify matters by emphasizing to Peking that the United States will fight if the coastal islands are attacked, even though it might relinquish the islands in a peaceful settlement. This is a highly risky situation in which the burden on the President is immense. The country has no choice now but to rely on his good sense and restraint. As Marquis Childs observes, it is a decision between war and peace, delegated to him by Congress, such as few Presidents have ever faced.

THE PRESIDENT'S FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY

Mr. BUSH. Mr. President, recently I had the privilege of discussing trade and tariff matters with Hon. Joseph E. Talbot, Vice Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission. Our discussion was filmed for broadcast this week by Connecticut stations WKNB, New Britain; WGTH, Hartford; WNHG, New Haven; WICC, Bridgeport; and WATR, Waterbury.

Mr. Talbot formerly practiced law in Naugatuck, Conn., and for three terms represented Connecticut's Fifth District in the House of Representatives. Our Fifth District in Connecticut is a highly industrialized area, and one of many in our State in which industries have grown up behind tariff protection.

In the belief that Mr. Talbot's views on H. R. 1, and his explanation of the procedure involved in tariff negotiations will be of interest to Members of the Senate and to the public generally, I ask unanimous consent that a transcript of our discussion be printed in the RECORD at the conclusion of these remarks.

There being no objection, the transcript was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

TRANSCRIPT OF A DISCUSSION OF PRESIDENT EISENHOWER'S FOREIGN ECONOMIC POLICY BY UNITED STATES SENATOR PRESCOTT BUSH AND THE HONORABLE JOSEPH E. TALBOT

Senator BUSH. Hello everybody, I'm glad to be able to bring my friends in Connecticut another report from Washington, today, as we did 2 weeks ago. And I'd like you to consider with me President Eisenhower's foreign economic policy, and more specifically his recommendations for authority to negotiate moderate reductions in tariffs.

Our guest in our previous report from Washington on this subject was Clarence Randall, who pointed out the importance of the President's program in contributing to America's strength in the cold war against international communism in which we, with other free nations, are engaged.

In our discussion with Mr. Randall, who served as Chairman of the President's Com-

mission on Foreign Economic Policy, we also emphasized that moderate tariff cuts can be made safely if the principles of gradualness, selectivity, and reciprocity are followed. They can have a stimulating effect on our whole economy, and create new opportunities for jobs.

Those principles have been insisted upon by President Eisenhower, who additionally has strongly recommended that we keep the so-called peril point and escape clause provisions of the present Trade Agreements Act.

With us today we are very fortunate to have an expert on those matters in the person of Joseph E. Talbot, Vice Chairman of the United States Tariff Commission. Of course, Joe Talbot is well known to the people of Connecticut. He is a former treasurer of our State, and for three terms he represented Connecticut's Fifth District in the Congress of the United States. Joe, it's good to have you with us today.

Mr. TALBOT. Thank you, Senator. I am delighted to visit again with our friends in Connecticut and to join you in an explanation of the technical details concerning our present and future trade agreements.

Senator BUSH. Joe, in my experience with tariff matters, which is not as extensive as yours, I've found that there's lot more heat than light generated by those who take the extremes on both sides of this issue. The freetraders represent one extreme; the highest protectionists the other.

The President's program has been under attack from both sides. It's my conviction, from the study of this problem over a period of the past 2 years, in particular, that his program will open up opportunities for increased trade among the free nations, have a stimulating effect upon our domestic economy and avoid serious injury to any of our industries, if it's properly administered. It will increase Connecticut's prosperity, and create new opportunities for jobs in this State and elsewhere. Based on your experience, do you agree with that point of view?

Mr. TALBOT. Yes, I do, Senator. The tariff-reduction provisions of the so-called Cooper bill, H. R. 1, are quite mild, and the record of Mr. Eisenhower's—President Eisenhower's—first 2 years in the White House indicates that when he uses them he uses them with restraint, especially as the Cooper bill does not seek in any way to modify the present peril point or the escape clause—which are the chief checks on cutting present tariff rates too deeply.

Senator BUSH. Joe, in the wide range of products produced by American industry, there are those on which tariffs can be safely reduced and others which are more vulnerable, and may need the protection they now have. Then, still others, indeed, may be in need of more protection. We see that from time to time. That's why the principle of selectivity has been insisted upon by the President. Let's discuss, for a minute or two, how we go about selecting the products on which tariffs may be negotiated.

Mr. TALBOT. Well, after the United States and let's say country X decide to negotiate a trade agreement, the first step in the selection of products for modification of import duties is a survey made by the Tariff Commission of past United States imports from that country. Meanwhile country X usually makes a list of products on which it desires modification of United States import duties. The data thus prepared by the Tariff Commission and the request list of country X are then studied by a committee of representatives of various Government agencies, including the Departments of State, Commerce, Agriculture, Treasury, Defense, Labor, and Interior, the United States Tariff Commission, and the Foreign Operations Administration.

Senator BUSH. That's Governor Stassen's group, isn't it?

Mr. TALBOT. That's right, Senator. This Country Committee, so-called, also considers all the factors known to it which are pertinent to the future composition and magnitude of the trade between the two countries. It is the general policy not to consider granting a concession on a particular product to a given country unless that country has been or is likely to be the principal, or a major supplier. In addition, the Country Committee carefully considers the competition between imports and domestic goods. On the basis of all these facts, the committee prepares a tentative list of articles on which the United States should consider granting concessions to country X.

Senator BUSH. The reason for all that procedure, Joe, I suppose, is to be certain we enter negotiations with our eyes open. Is that right?

Mr. TALBOT. That's correct, Senator. We want to make certain we have all the essential facts. But that's not the whole process we go through. The list is next sent for review by the Trade Agreements Committee, another interdepartmental committee, whose members represent the same Government departments as the Country Committee, I spoke about before. After careful study of all the facts, the Trade Agreements Committee transmits to the President a list of products for consideration in the negotiations. If the President accepts the Trade Agreements Committee's recommendations, as he usually does, the public is advised of this list and is entitled to supply at a public hearing information that may be useful in the conduct of the negotiations.

Senator BUSH. The Tariff Commission comes into the picture then by making peril-point findings. Does this come next?

Mr. TALBOT. Yes, Senator, after public hearings, the Tariff Commission makes its peril-point findings and sends them to the President. This places a floor below which the President and the Trade Agreements Committee cannot go; and if the President should go below that floor, he must justify his position to Congress. The inclusion of an item in the published list of products does not necessarily mean that a concession will actually be made on that. The information supplied by the manufacturers, and parties interested, may convince the Trade Agreements Committee that a concession should not be granted. Moreover, before the negotiations are completed, the Trade Agreements Committee must conclude that the United States will itself obtain concessions equivalent to those which it is prepared to grant, or to give away.

Senator BUSH. That's reciprocity.

Mr. TALBOT. That's right. In order to obtain a balanced agreement, the Trade Agreements Committee may conclude that certain concessions it was prepared to approve in the first instance should not be made by the United States.

Senator BUSH. That's why they are called reciprocal trade agreements, I presume, and why the President emphasizes reciprocity—which, of course, is as it should be. Now, Joe, we've been talking about the peril point, but I don't think we've defined just what it is, so how about telling us just what the law says about the peril point.

Mr. TALBOT. In plain language, the peril-point provision makes it the duty of the Tariff Commission to determine the lowest rate necessary to protect the domestic industry from serious injury from imports. This rate, which is called the peril-point rate, would ordinarily be expected to be a lower rate than the now existing rate in view of the nature of trade-agreement negotiations. However, if the Commission should find that

a higher rate than the existing rate is necessary to protect the domestic industry, it must name that higher rate as its peril-point rate, and the President is required to either negotiate at the increased rate in the trade agreement or explain to the Congress why he did not do so.

Senator BUSH. Some of our friends in Connecticut, Joe, have been advocating repeal or modification of the peril point. I haven't been able to agree with that. I think that the President's insistence on retention of this safeguard is wise. It offers the only sound method by which we can determine the facts before we enter tariff negotiations. Its the only way we can know the safe limits beyond which we should not go in cutting tariffs. Don't you think so?

Mr. TALBOR. Senator BUSH, even if the present method of establishing peril points and the safeguard of the escape clause were completely eliminated and abolished, some new method would have to be devised immediately to put on the brakes. We cannot sail the ship recklessly, without rudder or anchor. But more important than that, and I say this to those who are asking their Senators and Representatives to vote for abolition of the present peril-point and escape-clause provisions—I say to them, once you begin amending H. R. 1 with this, that, and the other thing, you're bound to end up with a great conglomeration of amendments that will result in the Randall Commission's report and the President's recommendations becoming almost meaningless. The escape clause is the only remedy left to the domestic industry for its protection after the trade agreement has been entered into and it also is a further safety valve in the event that the Tariff Commission may have been in error in the first place in finding a proper peril point.

Senator BUSH. Yes, Joe; I think we should certainly keep the escape clause, too. Now I see that our time is up so I want to thank you again for being with us and to my friends in Connecticut, see you in 2 weeks at the same place, same time. Goodbye.

BIPARTISAN CONSULTATIONS ON FOREIGN-POLICY MATTERS

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a compilation of the meetings and appearances of the Secretary of State with bipartisan congressional groups for the years 1953, 1954, and 1955, to date, together with a list of bipartisan consultations on foreign-policy matters with congressional leaders and committees.

There being no objection, the compilations were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEETINGS AND APPEARANCES OF THE SECRETARY OF STATE WITH BIPARTISAN CONGRESSIONAL GROUPS, 1953, 1954, AND 1955

1953—39 MEETINGS

January 22, 1953: House Foreign Affairs.
January 29, 1953: Congressional leadership.
February 10, 1953: Senate Foreign Relations.
February 13, 1953: Senate Far East Subcommittee.
February 17, 1953: House Foreign Affairs.
February 18, 1953: Senate Appropriations.
February 24, 1953: Senate Banking and Currency.
February 26, 1953: House Foreign Affairs.
February 26, 1953: Senate Foreign Relations.
March 18, 1953: Senate Foreign Relations.
March 18, 1953: House Appropriations.
March 24, 1953: Senate Foreign Relations Subcommittee.
March 25, 1953: Congressional leadership.
April 6, 1953: Senate Judiciary.
April 7, 1953: Senate Far East Subcommittee.
April 17, 1953: House Foreign Affairs.
April 17, 1953: Senate Foreign Relations.
April 28, 1953: House Foreign Affairs.
April 29, 1953: Senate Foreign Relations.
April 30, 1953: Senate Appropriations.
May 2, 1953: Senate Far East Subcommittee.
May 4, 1953: House Ways and Means.
May 6, 1953: House Foreign Affairs.
May 6, 1953: Senate Foreign Relations.
May 9, 1953: House Foreign Affairs and Senate Foreign Relations.
June 2, 1953: House Foreign Affairs.
June 3, 1953: Senate Foreign Relations.
June 8, 1953: Senate Far East Subcommittee.
June 12, 1953: Senate Agriculture.
June 15, 1953: House Agriculture.
June 19, 1953: Congressional leadership.
June 29, 1953: Senate leaders.
June 30, 1953: House Foreign Affairs and Senate Foreign Relations (Far East Subcommittee).
July 7, 1953: Senate Far East Subcommittee.
July 7, 1953: House Appropriations.
July 9, 1953: Congressional leadership.
July 9, 1953: Senate Appropriations.
July 25, 1953: House and Senate Far East Subcommittee.
October 14, 1953: House Foreign Affairs and Senate Foreign Relations.

1954—42 MEETINGS

January 5, 1954: Congressional leadership.
January 7, 1954: Senate Foreign Relations.

January 13, 1954: Senate Foreign Relations.
January 18, 1954: Senate U. N. Subcommittee.
January 19, 1954: House Foreign Affairs.
February 22, 1954: Congressional leadership.
February 23, 1954: House Foreign Affairs.
February 24, 1954: Senate Foreign Relations.
March 19, 1954: Senate Foreign Relations.
March 23, 1954: House Foreign Affairs.
April 3, 1954: Congressional leadership.
April 5, 1954: House Foreign Affairs.
April 6, 1954: Senate Minerals Subcommittee.
April 20, 1954: Congressional leadership.
May 5, 1954: Congressional leadership.
May 11, 1954: House Foreign Affairs.
May 12, 1954: Senate Foreign Relations.
May 17, 1954: Senate Appropriations.
May 21, 1954: Senate Appropriations.
May 21, 1954: House Judiciary leaders.
May 24, 1954: House leadership.
May 25, 1954: Senate Foreign Relations.
June 3, 1954: Joint Committee on Atomic Energy.
June 4, 1954: Senate Foreign Relations.
June 17, 1954: Senate Far East Subcommittee.
June 23, 1954: Congressional leadership.
June 24, 1954: House Appropriations Subcommittee.
June 28, 1954: Congressional leadership.
July 2, 1954: Senate Foreign Relations.
July 2, 1954: Senate Judiciary.
July 12, 1954: Senate Foreign Relations.
July 16, 1954: Senate Foreign Relations.
July 17, 1954: House Appropriations.
July 19, 1954: Senate Appropriations.
July 21, 1954: House Appropriations.
July 21, 1954: House Foreign Affairs.
July 22, 1954: Senate Appropriations.
July 22, 1954: Senate Foreign Relations.
July 27, 1954: Senate Foreign Relations.
August 20, 1954: Congressional leadership.
November 10, 1954: Senate Far East Subcommittee.
November 11, 1954: Senate Foreign Relations.

1955—7 MEETINGS

January 13, 1955: Senate Foreign Relations.
January 17, 1955: House Ways and Means Committee.
January 20, 1955: Congressional leadership.
January 24, 1955: House Foreign Affairs.
January 24, 1955: Senate Foreign Relations.
February 7, 1955: Senate Foreign Relations.
February 8, 1955: House Appropriations.

1953.....	39
1954.....	42
1955 (to date).....	7
Total (to date).....	88

Meetings held by the Secretary or the Under Secretary of State with congressional leaders and other Members of both Houses of Congress to consult on current foreign policy matters

Date	Subject	Members	Department
1953			
Apr. 17.....	Forthcoming Paris meeting of NATO Ministers.	Senators H. A. Smith, Hickenlooper, Taft, Langer, Ferguson, Knowland, George, Green, Gillette, Mansfield; Representatives Chipperfield, Vorys, Bolton, Judd, Jackson, LeCompte, Radwan, Adair, Bentley, Battle, Brooks Hays, Roosevelt, Kelly.	The Secretary.
May 9 (at Department of State).	Communist proposal on prisoners of war not desiring repatriation.	Senators H. A. Smith, Hickenlooper, Knowland, George, Sparkman; Representatives Chipperfield, Richards.	Do.
May 22 (at Department of State).	Far East.....	Senators Wiley, H. A. Smith, Hickenlooper, Ferguson, Knowland, George, Sparkman; Representatives Chipperfield, Vorys, Judd, Richards, Lanham.	The Under Secretary.
June 19 (at Department of State).	Korea.....	Senators Knowland, L. B. Johnson, H. A. Smith, George, Sparkman; Speaker Martin; Representatives Chipperfield, Vorys, Judd, Richards, Lanham.	The Secretary.
June 30 (at Department of State).	Korea.....	Senators Wiley, H. A. Smith, Hickenlooper, Knowland, Sparkman; Representatives Chipperfield, Vorys, Judd, Lanham.	The Secretary.
July 9 (at Department of State).	Proposed Foreign Ministers meeting.....	Senators Knowland, Millikin, Saltonstall, L. B. Johnson, Wiley, Bridges, George, Russell; Speaker Martin; Representatives Halleck, McCormack, Chipperfield.	Do.
July 25 (at Department of State).	Korean armistice and relations with the Republic of Korea.	Senators Wiley, H. A. Smith, Knowland, Sparkman; Representatives Chipperfield, Vorys, Judd, Richards, Lanham.	Do.
Oct. 14 (at Department of State).	London trip and special problems.....	Senators Wiley, Ferguson, Green, Sparkman; Representatives Vorys, Judd, Bureson, Zablocki.	Do.

Meetings held by the Secretary or the Under Secretary of State with congressional leaders and other Members of both Houses of Congress to consult on current foreign policy matters—Continued

Date	Subject	Members	Department
1954			
Jan. 22 (at Department of State).	Iranian oil situation.....	Vice President Nixon, Senators Knowland, L. B. Johnson, Wiley, Saltonstall, George; Speaker Martin; Representatives Priest, Halleck, Short, Rayburn.	The Under Secretary.
Feb. 8 (at Department of State).	Hoover Commission recommendations on Foreign Service.	Senators Wiley, Ferguson, George, Mansfield; Representatives Vorys, Bentley, Richards, Chatham.	Do.
Feb. 22 (at Department of State).	Berlin Conference.....	Senators Knowland, Saltonstall, Ferguson, L. B. Johnson, Clements, Wiley, George, Russell; Speaker Martin; Representatives Arends, Rayburn, McCormack, Chipfield, Richards.	The Secretary.
Apr. 3 (at Department of State).	International security problems and Indochina.	Senators Knowland, Millikin, L. B. Johnson, Clements, Russell; Speaker Martin; Representatives McCormack, Priest.	The Secretary, also Deputy Secretary of Defense Kyes, Secretary Anderson, and Admiral Radford.
Apr. 20 (at Department of State).	Recent discussions in Europe and plans for Geneva Conference.	Senators Knowland, Ferguson, Millikin, Saltonstall, L. B. Johnson, Clements, Wiley, Bridges, Hickenlooper, Green, Russell, Fulbright; Representatives Arends, Chipfield, Brooks Hays, Fisher.	The Secretary.
Apr. 26 (at Department of State).	Indochina.....	Senators H. A. Smith, Hickenlooper, Langer, Fulbright, Gillette, Mansfield; Representatives Chipfield, L. H. Smith, Fulton, Carnahan, Zablocki.	The Acting Secretary.
May 5 (at Department of State).	Report on Geneva Conference.....	Senators Knowland, Ferguson, Millikin, Saltonstall, L. B. Johnson, Clements, Wiley, Bridges, H. A. Smith, George, Russell, Green; Speaker Martin; Representatives Halleck, Arends, Rayburn, McCormack, Chipfield, Short, Vorys, Judd, Gordon, Vinson, Lanham.	The Secretary.
July 20.....	Germany.....	Senators Knowland, Ferguson; Representatives Martin, Halleck....	Do.
1955			
Jan. 20.....	Far eastern situation.....	Senators George, Wiley, Byrd, Saltonstall, Clements, Knowland; Representatives Richards, Chipfield, Arends, McCormack, Martin, and Vinson.	The Secretary, Under Secretary, Mr. Robertson, Admiral Radford, Mr. Morton.

Meetings held by the Secretary or other principal officers of the Department with the Senate Foreign Relations Committee or subcommittees of that committee to consult on current foreign policy matters

Date	Subject	Committee	Department
1953			
Feb. 10	Recent European trip with Mr. Stassen.....	Foreign Relations Committee.....	The Secretary; Mr. Stassen.
13	Far eastern policy.....	Subcommittee, Far Eastern Affairs.....	The Secretary.
18	Situation in the Far East.....	Subcommittee, Near Eastern and African Affairs.....	Assistant Secretary Byroade.
26	German debt settlement agreements.....	Subcommittee, Economic and Social Policy Affairs.....	Legal Adviser Phleger; Mr. Riddleberger.
Mar. 13	Situation in Latin America.....	Subcommittee, American Republic Affairs.....	Assistant Secretary Cabot.
25	Korea.....	Subcommittee, Far Eastern Affairs.....	The Secretary.
Apr. 2	Proposed German cultural convention and revival of Treaty of Friendship, Commerce, and Consular Rights of 1923 with Germany.	Subcommittee, European Affairs.....	Mr. Riddleberger.
7	Soviet proposals.....	Subcommittee, Far Eastern Affairs.....	The Secretary.
10	Palestine refugees.....	Subcommittee, Near Eastern and African Affairs.....	Assistant Secretary Byroade.
13	Problems before United Nations; Korea; selection new Secretary General; security United States employees.	Subcommittee, United Nations Affairs.....	Assistant Secretary Hickerson.
24	Reactivation of Treaty of Friendship, Commerce, and Consular Rights of 1923 with Germany.	Subcommittee, European Affairs.....	Mr. Riddleberger.
29	Paris NATO meeting.....	Foreign Relations Committee.....	The Secretary.
May 2	Far eastern situation.....	Subcommittee, Far Eastern Affairs.....	Do.
26	Permanent representative on North Atlantic Council.....	Subcommittee, State Department Organization.....	Assistant Secretary Merchant.
27	Situation in Latin America.....	Subcommittee, American Republic Affairs.....	Assistant Secretary Cabot.
June 3	Trip to Middle East and South Asia.....	Foreign Relations Committee.....	The Secretary.
4	European Coal and Steel Community.....	Subcommittee, Economic and Social Policy Affairs.....	Mr. Moore with Mr. Monnet.
5	do.....	Foreign Relations Committee.....	Miss Camp with Mr. Monnet.
8	Korea.....	Subcommittee, Far Eastern Affairs.....	The Secretary.
9	Spanish base agreement.....	Subcommittee, European Affairs.....	Assistant Secretary Merchant.
July 7	Korea.....	Subcommittee, Far Eastern Affairs.....	The Secretary.
16	Situation in Korea.....	Foreign Relations Committee.....	Assistant Secretary Robertson.
23	Problems before the U. N.....	do.....	Ambassador Lodge.
28	International Tin Conference.....	Subcommittee, Economic and Social Policy Affairs.....	Assistant Secretary Waugh.
1954			
Jan. 7	World developments.....	Foreign Relations Committee.....	The Secretary.
Feb. 3	Situation in Guatemala.....	do.....	Mr. Fisher.
16	Indochina.....	do.....	The Under Secretary.
18	Military assistance to Pakistan.....	Subcommittee, Near East and African Affairs.....	Assistant Secretary Byroade.
19	Panama development program.....	Subcommittee, American Republic Affairs.....	Mr. Muccio.
24	Indochina.....	Foreign Relations Committee.....	The Secretary.
Mar. 26	The Saar.....	Subcommittee, European Affairs.....	Assistant Secretary Merchant.
Apr. 12	Proposed convention of protection of cultural objects during armed conflict.	Subcommittee, United Nations Affairs.....	Mrs. Flexner, Miss Roach.
28	Situation in Germany.....	Foreign Relations Committee.....	Ambassador Conant.
May 7	Situation in Latin America.....	Subcommittee, American Republic Affairs.....	Assistant Secretary Holland.
12	Geneva conference.....	Foreign Relations Committee.....	The Secretary.
21	Situation in Latin America.....	Subcommittee, American Republic Affairs.....	Assistant Secretary Holland.
21	do.....	do.....	Do.
25	Far East situation.....	Foreign Relations Committee.....	The Secretary.
June 11	Situation in the Near East.....	Subcommittee, Near Eastern and African Affairs.....	Assistant Secretary Byroade.
17	Guatemala situation.....	Subcommittee, American Republic Affairs.....	Assistant Secretary Holland.
17	Indochina.....	Subcommittee, Far Eastern Affairs.....	The Secretary.
22	German contractual relations.....	Subcommittee, European Affairs.....	Assistant Secretary Merchant.
25	Guatemala situation.....	Subcommittee, American Republic Affairs.....	Assistant Secretary Holland.
July 16	Geneva conference.....	Foreign Relations Committee.....	The Secretary.
28	Panama Treaty.....	Subcommittee, American Republic Affairs.....	Assistant Secretary Holland.
Nov. 10	Manila pact.....	Subcommittee, Far Eastern Affairs.....	The Secretary, Mr. Robertson, Mr. MacArthur.
1955			
Jan. 13	Report on world developments.....	Foreign Relations Committee.....	The Secretary, Mr. Morton.
19	Review of situation in France.....	do.....	Ambassador Dillon, Mr. Fisher (WE).
Feb. 17	Germany.....	do.....	Ambassador Conant.

Meetings held by the Secretary or other principal officers of the Department with the House Foreign Affairs Committee or subcommittee of that committee to consult on current foreign policy matters

Date	Subject	Committee	Department
1953			
Jan. 22	World situation	Foreign Affairs Committee	The Secretary.
Feb. 17	Recent European trip with Mr. Stassen	do	The Secretary, Mr. Stassen.
25	Current developments in Europe	Subcommittee, Europe	Deputy Assistant Secretary Bonbright.
Mar. 2	Analysis of political trends, including Guatemala and Argentina.	Subcommittee, Inter-American Affairs	Deputy Assistant Secretary Mann.
5	Political and economic situation in Near East	Subcommittee, Near East and Africa	Mr. Gardiner.
10	Situation in Iran, Egypt, and Israel	do	Assistant Secretary Byroade.
11	Berlin refugee problem	Subcommittee, Europe	Mr. Riddleberger.
12	Economic situation in various parts of world	Subcommittee, Foreign Economic Policy	Assistant Secretary Linder.
18	The United Nations	Subcommittee, International Organizations and Movements.	Assistant Secretary Hickerson.
19	International security situation	do	The Under Secretary.
25	European organization	Foreign Affairs Committee	Mr. Stassen, Assistant Secretary Merchant.
25	United States position at rubber study meeting, Copenhagen, May 10.	Subcommittee, Foreign Economic Policy	Mr. Armstrong.
27	United States participation in international organizations	Subcommittee, International Organizations and Movements.	Assistant Secretary Hickerson.
Apr. 24	Situation in Indochina	Subcommittee, Far East and the Pacific	Mr. Bonsal.
28	NATO Paris meeting	Foreign Affairs Committee	The Secretary.
May 7	Situation in Spain	Subcommittee, Europe	Ambassador Dunn.
20	International Organizations; Palestine refugees	Subcommittee, International Organizations and Movements.	Mr. Ingram.
22	Situation in Latin America	Subcommittee, Inter-American Affairs	Assistant Secretary Cabot.
26	Permanent representative on North Atlantic Council	Subcommittee, State Department Organization and Personnel.	Assistant Secretary Merchant.
June 2	Trip to Middle East and South Asia	Foreign Affairs Committee	The Secretary.
4	Spanish Base Agreement	Subcommittee, Europe	Assistant Secretary Merchant.
July 2	Situation in Panama	Subcommittee, Inter-American Affairs	Ambassador Wiley.
8	Korea and the United Nations	Subcommittee, International Organizations and Movements.	Ambassador Lodge.
16	Situation in Korea	Foreign Affairs Committee	Assistant Secretary Robertson.
16	Foreign economic policy	Subcommittees, Foreign Economic Policy and Inter-American Affairs.	Assistant Secretary Waugh.
28	International Tin Conference	Subcommittee, Foreign Economic Policy	Assistant Secretary Waugh.
30	Riots in East Germany and United States food shipments	Subcommittee, Europe	Mr. Lewis.
1954			
Jan. 19	The GATT meeting; questions on East-West Trade	Subcommittee, Foreign Economic Policy	Assistant Secretary Waugh.
19	Review of world developments	Foreign Affairs Committee	The Secretary.
26	Situation in Guatemala	do	Ambassador Peurifoy.
27	Lima Conference	do	Mr. Stassen, Mr. Nolting.
28	Proposed arrangements for settlement of war damage claims under the Italian Peace Treaty.	Subcommittee, Europe	Deputy Assistant Secretary Elbrick.
Feb. 2	Security of American employees of the United Nations	Subcommittee, International Organizations and Movements.	Ambassador Lodge.
5	Problems of the Near East area	Subcommittee, Near East and Africa	Assistant Secretary Byroade.
16	Economic defense program	Subcommittee, Foreign Economic Policy	Deputy Assistant Secretary Kaljarvi.
17	Situation in Japan	Subcommittee, Far East and the Pacific	Ambassador Allison.
18	Indochina	Foreign Affairs Committee	The Under Secretary.
19	Panama development program	Subcommittee, Inter-American Affairs	Mr. Muccio.
Mar. 23	Caracas Conference	Foreign Affairs Committee	The Secretary.
24	Conditions in Near East	Subcommittee, Near East and Africa	Mr. Gardiner.
25	European Defense Community and the Saar	Subcommittee, Europe	Assistant Secretary Merchant.
Apr. 1	Congressman Smith's trip to the Near East	Subcommittee, Near East and Africa	Mr. Gardiner.
9	Caracas Conference	Subcommittee, Inter-American Affairs	Assistant Secretary Holland.
May 11	Geneva Conference	Foreign Affairs Committee	The Secretary.
19	Situation in Latin America	Subcommittee, Inter-American Affairs	Assistant Secretary Holland.
June 9	Guatemala situation	do	Do.
July 20	Rio Economic Conference	Subcommittees, Inter-American Affairs and Foreign Economic Policy.	Assistant Secretaries Holland and Waugh.
21	Geneva Conference	Foreign Affairs Committee	The Secretary.
1955			
Feb. 1	Indochina	do	Gen. J. Lawton Collins.
18	Germany	Foreign Affairs Subcommittee on Europe	Ambassador Conant.

AMENDMENT OF SECTION 2 (A) OF THE ROBINSON-PATMAN ACT

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, there are now pending before the Committee on the judiciary bills to amend section 2 (b) of the Robinson-Patman Act having exactly opposite purposes. These bills are S. 780, introduced by me, and S. 11, introduced by the Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER] and other Senators.

Throughout the past 5 years interested Government agencies, and the White House, have frequently, and with consistency, expressed themselves on these bills. I sent to each member of the Judiciary Committee a memorandum of the actions by Government agencies during the past 5 years on this subject. This documented history seems so persuasive to me that I ask unanimous consent to have it included in the body of the RECORD as a part of my remarks so that it may be available to the entire Senate.

There being no objection, the memorandum was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

MEMORANDUM RE KEFAUVER (S. 11) AND CAPEHART (S. 780) BILLS (84TH CONG.)

Senator KEFAUVER (and 29 other Senators) introduced S. 11 on January 6, 1955, to amend section 2 (b) of the Robinson-Patman Act to provide that the defense of good faith meeting of the equally low price of a competitor should not apply whenever its effect may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce. Senator KEFAUVER's statement accompanying the bill was a repetition of a previous statement that the Federal Trade Commission found it necessary to challenge almost in its entirety. On January 27, 1955, Senator CAPEHART introduced S. 780 to make the good faith meeting of an equally low price of a competitor a full defense to a charge of price discrimination. Senator CAPEHART accompanied introduction of his bill with a letter from the White House saying that that bill was in accord with President Eisenhower's program. These bills are for opposite purposes.

History of proposals: Beginning in the Truman administration, and continuing in the Eisenhower administration, the Kefauver proposal has been opposed, and the Capehart proposal approved by the Department of Justice, Department of Commerce, and the President's Council of Economic Advisors. In the Truman administration the Federal Trade Commission at one time supported the Kefauver proposal and at another time supported the Capehart proposal. The present Commission has supported the Capehart proposal.

In the Truman administration the White House advised that a bill similar to the Capehart proposal (S. 1008, 81st Cong.) was in accord with the President's program. President Truman later vetoed that bill; but for the reason that confusion might follow from its legislative history, which included adoption of an amendment following the Kefauver proposal, that was later modified in conference.

The Kefauver bill would enact into law a construction of the present act which the Federal Trade Commission, without the support of the Department of Justice, had argued in the Standard Oil case and which was expressly rejected by the Supreme Court

in that case (340 U. S. 231; 1951). Senator KEFAUVER, in spite of objections from the Department of Justice, has attempted to write this concept into bills dealing with this subject that have been before the Congress in the past 5 years.

Since the purpose of the Kefauver bill is to overrule the Supreme Court decision in the Standard Oil case, it is necessary to consider both the pertinent provisions of the Robinson-Patman Act and to understand what the Supreme Court held in that case.

The statute: Section 2 (a) of the Robinson-Patman Act makes unlawful discrimination in price "where the effect of such discrimination may be substantially to lessen competition, or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce, or to injure, destroy or prevent competition with any person who either grants, or knowingly receives, the benefit of such discrimination, or with customers of either of them."

Section 2 (b) provides that a seller may rebut a charged violation of section 2 (a) "by showing that his lower price . . . was made in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor."

In the absence of a price discrimination having the adverse effect on competition provided for in section 2 (a) there is no occasion for the defense in section 2 (b) ever to be invoked. However, as shown below, the Kefauver bill would make that defense not available whenever there was present the very competitive effect required to bring the pricing practice within the condemnation of the act in the first place. This is the equivalent of eliminating the meeting of competition defense from the act entirely because it is made inapplicable to every case in which it might ever be invoked.

Section 2 (a) applies to price discriminations that may lessen competition, tend to create a monopoly, or injure competition with any person, etc. The Kefauver bill would make the section 2 (b) defense inapplicable only where there may be a substantial lessening of competition, or a tendency toward monopoly. It might appear on the surface that the defense would still be available whenever its effect might only be to injure competition with any person, etc. However, the courts have not distinguished between substantially to lessen competition and to injure competition with any person, etc. Both the courts and the Commission have treated those phrases as having the same meaning. Therefore, the proposed bill would make the defense of good faith meeting of an equally low price of a competitor meaningless; and the bill has been so construed by all responsible officials of the Government concerned with the act.

The Standard Oil case: Despite the plain language of section 2 (b), in the Standard Oil case the Federal Trade Commission ruled that the defense of good faith meeting of a lower price of a competitor did not apply if the Commission found an injury to competition among resellers.

That case involved gasoline marketing in the Detroit area where there were 130 licensed jobbers—gasoline buyers taking delivery in tank car quantities, who had their own bulk storage plants, and had truck distribution facilities for deliveries to retail stations. Standard had had 7 of those jobber customers but had lost 3 to competitors. The case involved the legality of Standard's trying not to lose those accounts by giving its remaining 4 customers the tank car price at which all other jobbers were buying from other suppliers. That price was 1½ cents a gallon below the price to retail service station customers. The Commission charged that it was unlawful for Standard to get a higher price from its retailer customers who purchased in small quantities delivered by truck to their retail stations.

Standard admittedly could not have retained those 4 customers unless it sold to

them at the jobber tank car price. It was recognized that the statute could not be applied to other competing suppliers who sold only at one price level to jobbers and offered those customers the same jobber price. Since Standard also sold to retailers in the same area and because one or more of those jobbers resold at cut prices, the Commission contended that Standard had no right to retain its jobber customers.

The Commission's trial examiner made the finding that, "the lower prices allowed these four customers were in fact granted to meet equally low prices of competitors."

In reviewing the Commission's ruling, the court of appeals found that, "it may be assumed to be conclusive" that Standard "made its low price" to the four jobber customers "in good faith to meet the lower price of a competitor."

The Commission's own findings are that: "It may well be that respondent was convinced that if it ceased granting tank car prices to (the four jobber customers) it would lose those accounts. It had substantial reason for believing this to be the case."

The Supreme Court stated the Commission's position, and its effect upon the statutory defense, as follows: "The proviso in section 2 (b), as interpreted by the Commission, would not be available when there was or might be an injury to competition at a resale level. So interpreted the proviso would have such little if any, applicability as to be practically meaningless."

The Supreme Court rejected the Commission's view that the statutory defense was not available whenever there might be an injury to competition. The Court said:

"It must have been obvious to Congress that any price reduction to any dealer may always affect competition at that dealer's level as well as at the dealer's resale level whether or not the reduction to the dealer is discriminatory."

Of the pricing rigidity that would be required if a seller had only the alternatives of reducing his prices to all of his customers, or to none of them, the Court said:

"There is nothing to show a congressional purpose, in such a situation, to compel the seller to choose only between ruinously cutting its prices to all its customers to match the price offered to one, or refusing to meet the competition and then ruinously raising its prices to its remaining customers to cover increased unit costs. There is, on the other hand, plain language and established practice which permits a seller, through section 2 (b), to retain a customer by realistically meeting in good faith the price offered to that customer, without necessarily changing the seller's price to its other customers."

That decision was by a divided Court, 5 to 3. However, the Justices were unanimous in their view that the construction urged by the Commission, and now embodied in the Kefauver bill, would weaken competition. The premise of the dissenting Justices, however, was that Congress had intended so to do.

The minority opinion stated:

"Nondiscriminatory pricing tends to weaken competition in that a seller, while otherwise maintaining his prices, cannot meet his antagonist's price to get a single order or customer. But Congress obviously concluded that the greater advantage would accrue by fostering equal access to supplies by competing merchants or other purchasers in the course of business."

The majority of the Court refused to believe that the Congress had intended to thus restrict the right to compete, saying:

"It is enough to say that Congress did not seek by the Robinson-Patman Act either to abolish competition or so radically to curtail it that a seller would have no substantial right of self-defense against a price raid by a competitor."

The majority opinion also quoted (in a footnote) from a TNEC monograph written in 1941 by members of the Federal Trade Commission staff. That monograph said of this provision:

"The amended act now safeguards the right of a seller to discriminate in price in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor, but he has the burden of proof on that question. This right is guaranteed by statute and could not be curtailed by any mandate or order of the Commission. . . . The right of self defense against competitive price attacks is as vital in a competitive economy as the right of self defense against personal attack."

The ultimate conclusion of the majority opinion of the Supreme Court, apparently the primary basis of its decision, was that:

"The heart of our national economic policy long has been faith in the value of competition. In the Sherman and Clayton Acts, as well as in the Robinson-Patman Act, 'Congress was dealing with competition, which it sought to protect, and monopoly, which it sought to prevent.'"

Concerning the statement by Senator KEFAUVER on his bill: In a letter to the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee dated June 16, 1953, the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission said that the Commission felt "compelled to comment for the record" in order "to avoid any misunderstanding, and to avoid any misconception," which might result from Senator KEFAUVER's statements about the similar bill he introduced in 1953. The Commission referred to glaring errors in a statement released by Senator KEFAUVER which appears in large part in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 18, 1953, volume 99, part 2, pages 2045-2046.

Senator KEFAUVER's statement says that the good faith defense, "permits any price discrimination, regardless of its effect upon small business or competition as long as it is made in good faith." The Commission's comment is: "The defense is in fact available only to meet an equally low price that a competitor offers to a customer. It does not permit any other price discriminations."

Senator KEFAUVER's statement says, "the burden is upon enforcement agencies to prove the discrimination was not in good faith—which is almost impossible as a practicable matter." The Commission's comment is: "The burden is in fact upon the seller to show his good faith. The Court so held in the Standard Oil case. It is for the Commission to decide whether the seller has proved that he acted in good faith. The Commission does not have to prove the seller's bad faith."

The statement says that, "the Court held that good faith is a complete defense to a charge of price discrimination under the Robinson-Patman Act." The Commission's comment is: "The Court in fact concluded that a seller is permitted to meet 'in good faith a lawful and equally low price of its competitor'."

The statement says:

"The big supplier can drive these smaller competitors out of business by reducing his price in one market at a time, making up any losses through higher prices charged elsewhere."

The Commission's comment is:

"This is in fact not possible under the defense in question for it would not be meeting the equally low price of a competitor. More important, such conduct has frequently been held unlawful under the Sherman Act and we think it inconceivable that conduct which violates the Sherman Act could be said to be in good faith. Certainly this Commission would never find such conduct in good faith. That type of predatory price cutting, which had been held unlawful by this Commission before the enactment of the Robinson-Patman Act, is certainly an attempt to monopolize and is thus specifically excepted from the Capehart bill."

The statement says:

"As the law now stands, there is no limit on discriminations, as long as they are made in good faith. Once this simple test is met the big firm is given carte blanche to drive his smaller competitors out of business and to create monopolies."

The Commission's comment is:

"We do not believe that such is the existing law. As noted above, the defense applies only to meeting an equally low price which a competitor is already offering to the customers. The seller must affirmatively prove his good faith and this is not a simple matter (as is inferred in the statement quoted above). Creating—or even attempting to create—monopolies is never good faith, nor is the carte blanche destruction of others. The Commission does not consider good faith as a meaningless requirement. It means that the seller must convince the Commission that he acted for proper competitive purposes, and not in a predatory manner."

The statement further says that under that bill:

"The good-faith defense would still be a complete defense in all cases except where the effect of the discrimination fell short of probable injury to competition."

The Commission's comment is:

"As we have shown above, the exception would include virtually every possible case. Under the decisions in the Morton Salt and Standard Oil cases, it is unlikely that any price difference to meet the equally low price of a competitor would fall short of probable injury to competition."

Nevertheless, on January 6, 1955, Senator KEFAUVER again repeated the same statements previously challenged by the Federal Trade Commission in introducing the pending bill. Except for a paragraph on the legislative history of his proposal, Senator KEFAUVER's statement in introducing S. 11 is verbatim the officially challenged statement he made in 1953.

Perhaps the most glaring extent to which Senator KEFAUVER has been misadvised is with respect to the burden of proof. The statute makes clear, as does the Supreme Court opinion, that the burden of showing good faith is upon the seller who seeks to avail himself of the defense. This is repeatedly emphasized by the Court. The existing statutory language is "that nothing herein contained shall prevent a seller rebutting the case made against him by showing that his lower price * * * was made in good faith to meet an equally low price of a competitor."

Referring to two prior cases in which the defense was denied to a seller, the Court said in the *Standard Oil* case: "The decision in each case was based upon the sufficiency of the seller's evidence to establish its defense." The Court also quoted from an earlier case in which it said that "petitioner [seller] failed to sustain the burden of showing that the price discriminations were granted for the purpose of meeting competition" (emphasis added by the Court).

The Court quoted from an earlier case the conclusion that:

"We agree with the Commission that the statute at least requires the seller, who has knowingly discriminated in price, to show the existence of facts which would lead a reasonable and prudent person to believe that the granting of a lower price would in fact meet the equally low price of a competitor. Nor was the Commission wrong in holding that respondents failed to meet this burden."

Finally the Supreme Court said in the *Standard Oil* case that:

"In a case where a seller sustains the burden of proof placed upon it to establish its defense under section 2 (b), we find no reason to destroy that defense indirectly, merely because it also appears that the beneficiaries of the seller's price reductions may derive a

competitive advantage from them or may, in a natural course of events, reduce their own resale prices to their customers."

After identifying the bill's cosponsors, the opening paragraphs of Senator KEFAUVER's statement introducing his pending bill are:

"I am today offering a bill to plug a glaring loophole in the Robinson-Patman amendment. * * * The loophole is the so-called good-faith defense which permits any price discrimination, regardless of its effect upon small business or competition as long as it is made in good faith. * * * The loophole stemmed from the decision of the Supreme Court in the *Standard Oil of Indiana* case (340 U. S. 231)."

Certainly the statute does not permit "any price discrimination, regardless of its effect, * * * as long as it is made in good faith." As the Supreme Court said in the *Standard Oil* case, "the defense in subsection (b), now before us, is limited to a price reduction made to meet in good faith an equally low price of a competitor." The Court quoted from an earlier case that the proviso required the seller to show "that the granting of a lower price would, in fact, meet the equally low price of a competitor." And the Court said that section 2 (b) permits a seller "to retain a customer by realistically meeting in good faith the price offered to that customer without necessarily changing the seller's price to its other customers."

The Court's opinion makes clear that the proviso does not apply to any discrimination made in good faith, but that it applies only to a price reduction by a seller to meet a lower price which his competitor is offering to the customer. Section 2 (b) does not permit a seller to reduce his price to meet an unlawful price of a competitor, to grant a price which he does not have reason to believe is in fact offered to the customer by his competitor, or to meet a price which bona fide competition does not require him to meet.

Official Government views: Since the Truman administration, the Department of Justice has opposed the principle of the Kefauver bill. The same is true of the Department of Commerce and the President's Council of Economic Advisers. President Truman in 1949 supported the principle of a bill by Senator O'MAHONEY directly contrary to the Kefauver proposal, although in 1950 he vetoed that bill on the ground that amendments adopted in the Congress might cause confusion and therefore not succeed in clarifying the law. The Federal Trade Commission, during the preceding administration, shifted back and forth; but at the present time the Federal Trade Commission is firmly on record in opposition to the Kefauver bill.

In 1949 the Department of Justice spokesman, opposing the Kefauver proposal, told the House Judiciary Committee:

"First we would recommend deletion of the parenthetical phrases in sections 2 and 3, the so-called Kefauver amendment. * * * While we recognize the competitive problem which arises when one purchaser obtains advantages denied to other purchasers, we do not believe the solution to this problem lies in denying to sellers the opportunity to make sales in good faith competition with other sellers."

The Supreme Court's opinion shows that opposition of the Department of Justice to the Kefauver amendment was a factor considered by the Court in reaching its decision.

In a letter dated November 27, 1953, to the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee the Department of Justice again opposed the Kefauver proposal, giving the same reasons for its conclusion that it "does not favor the enactment of this (Kefauver) bill."

The June 16, 1953, letter of the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission to the chairman of the Senate Judiciary Committee analyzed and opposed the Kefauver bill.

That letter expresses the views of the majority of the Commission as:

"The Kefauver bill would have the effect of overturning the Supreme Court decision in the *Standard Oil* case (340 U. S. 231). A majority of the Commission believes that it should not be enacted into law. * * *

"Our free enterprise system requires competition in all areas. In fact, our whole theory of trade regulation is based upon the existence of competition in every market. If such regulation is to remain effective, a seller must be permitted, when acting fairly and in good faith, to meet the equally low price of a competitor. We think the Supreme Court reaffirmed this fundamental principle in the case of *Standard Oil v. Federal Trade Commission* (340 U. S. 231), but if a legislative restatement seems necessary or desirable we believe the Capehart bill will accomplish this. The view recently, but no longer, urged by a majority of the Commission, and which is the basis for the Kefauver bill, is that meeting the equally low price of a competitor should not be a defense whenever it injures competition. As a practical matter this completely nullifies the defense, and it would then never be available to any seller, for the Supreme Court has already held that every substantial difference in price may injure competition."

The Secretary of Commerce wrote the chairman of the Senate Committee on the Judiciary on October 9, 1953, opposing the Kefauver bill. He said that—

"S. 1357 adopts the minority opinion of the Supreme Court in the *Standard Oil* case. In our opinion, S. 1357 would invalidate the defense of meeting in good faith a lower competitive price whenever the effect 'may be substantially to lessen competition or tend to create a monopoly in any line of commerce.' This would, in our opinion, destroy the availability of this defense for all practical purposes and in effect prevent real competition."

Conclusions: It may be urged, as noted earlier, that the Kefauver bill would only prohibit good faith meeting of an equally low price of a competitor when its effect might be substantially to lessen competition; and it would not prohibit doing so when the effect might only be to injure competition with any person, etc.

But as interpreted by the courts and by the Commission, "substantially to lessen competition" and "to injure competition with any person" are one and the same.

In one Commission case the order goes so far as to find that:

"These arguments [that prices were made for the purpose of meeting competition] show that respondent's discriminatory prices were made to retain the business of certain customers or to secure the business of others and that they were largely successful in doing so. To the extent that business is held by or diverted to respondent from its competitors by its discriminatory prices and unfair practices, competition has been adversely affected within the meaning of the law." (FTC Docket 4920; reversed on other grounds by the court of appeals, seventh circuit.)

The Kefauver bill is generally referred to as the equal-opportunity bill. Its avowed purpose is to give every buyer an equal opportunity to buy at the same price. The difficulty with this concept, as noted by the Supreme Court, is that it eliminates price competition and materially weakens our competitive system.

Dr. John D. Clark, a member of President Truman's Council of Economic Advisors, testifying in favor of an earlier proposal contrary to the Kefauver bill, told a congressional committee that:

"All competitive effort is burdensome and harmful to those who cannot keep pace, but if we said it must stop short before it hurts anyone we would completely abandon the policy of competition."

On May 25, 1954, the Director of the Bureau of the Budget wrote Senator CAPEHART transmitting a draft bill slightly revising his prior bill to reaffirm the Supreme Court decision in the Standard Oil case. That letter advises that it was, "agreed upon by you, us, and the Chairman of the Federal Trade Commission, the Assistant Attorney General in charge of the Antitrust Division and the representatives of the Secretary of Commerce, and the Council of Economic Advisors." That letter concludes, "I am authorized to inform you that enactment of the draft bill [to reaffirm the Standard Oil decision] would be in accordance with the program of the President" (CONGRESSIONAL RECORD, volume 100, part 7, pages 8561-8562). This bill is now pending as S. 780 (84th Cong.).

The Supreme Court, in rejecting the Commission's prior construction of existing law and the proposal of the Kefauver bill, said:

"We need not now reconcile, in its entirety, the economic theory which underlies the Robinson-Patman Act with that of the Sherman and Clayton Acts. It is enough to say that Congress did not seek by the Robinson-Patman Act either to abolish competition or so radically to curtail it that a seller would have no substantial right of self-defense against a price paid by a competitor."

This is what the Kefauver bill is designed to do.

COMPARISON OF PRESENT WAGES OF CITY LETTER CARRIERS WITH INCREASES PROVIDED IN H. R. 1592 AND H. R. 2987

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD a letter addressed to me under date of February 21, 1955, by William C. Doherty, president of the National Association of Letter Carriers, relating to the proposed pay increase for postal employees, and also a table enclosed with the letter.

There being no objection, the letter and table were ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF LETTER CARRIERS.
Washington D. C., February 21, 1955.
Hon. WILLIAM LANGER,
United States Senate,
Senate Office Building,
Washington, D. C.
DEAR SENATOR LANGER: As a member of the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service, the enclosed chart should be helpful in comparing present postal wages for city letter carriers with the increases provided for in H. R. 1592 and in H. R. 2987.
The chart was prepared primarily to present a comparison of city letter carrier wages

only, all of whom are assigned to salary level 4 in H. R. 2987. However, an exactly identical comparison is applicable to another large group of postal employees.

According to the figures furnished your committee by the Post Office Department (Salary Plan, Schedules and Statistical Comparisons, 1955, p. 2), a total of 300,371 carriers and clerks now in the salary range \$3,270 to \$4,070 under Public Law 134, as amended, are all assigned to salary level 4 under H. R. 2987. These 300,371 represent by far the great bulk of employees in the field postal service—exclusive of rural carriers and postmasters at fourth-class offices, these 300,371 employees represent 72.8 percent of those occupying key positions under H. R. 2987.

Many among this large group are long-time career employees now in longevity grades A, B, or C, acquired after 13, 18, and 25 years' service. The column on the extreme right side of the chart indicates that among city letter carriers alone, 55.3 percent of the regular force are in the longevity grades. Under the terms of H. R. 2987, these veteran employees would receive from 4.81 to 5.04 percent in salary increases.

Trusting this chart will be helpful in your consideration of the salary bills before you, and with every personal good wish, I am

Sincerely,
W. C. DOHERTY,
President.

National Association of Letter Carriers—Effect of pending postal pay legislation on letter carrier salaries

Present		Proposed by H. R. 1592—S. 1				Proposed by H. R. 2987—S. 773 (salary level 4)								Number regular carriers ¹⁰
Grades ¹	Salaries	Grades ²	Salaries	Dollars, increase ³	Percent, increase ⁴	Grades ⁵	Salaries	Increase on enactment		Increase or decrease on adjust- ment ⁷	Total adjustment			
								Dollars ⁶	Percent		Dollars	Percent ⁸		
1.....	\$3,270	1.....	\$3,700	\$430	13.15	1.....	\$3,590	{	\$163.50	5	+\$156.50	\$320	9.78	192
2.....	3,350	2.....	3,800	430	12.76				168.50	5	+51.50	220	6.53	718
3.....	3,470	3.....	3,900	430	12.39	2.....	3,705	{	173.50	5	+61.50	235	6.77	1,350
4.....	3,570	4.....	4,000	430	12.04	3.....	3,820		178.50	5	+71.50	250	7.00	2,216
5.....	3,670	5.....	4,100	430	11.72	4.....	3,935	{	183.50	5	+81.50	265	7.22	3,755
6.....	3,770	6.....	4,200	430	11.41	5.....	4,050		188.50	5	+91.50	280	7.43	12,044
7.....	3,870	7.....	4,300	430	11.11	6.....	4,165	{	193.50	5	+101.50	295	7.62	9,515
8.....	3,970	8.....	4,400	430	10.83	7.....	4,280		198.50	5	+111.50	310	7.81	4,425
9.....	4,070	9.....	4,500	430	10.57	A.....	4,380	{	203.50	5	+6.50	210	5.16	5,818
A.....	4,170	A.....	4,600	430	10.31				208.50	5	+1.50	210	5.04	16,328
B.....	4,270	B.....	4,700	430	10.07	B.....	4,480	{	(213.50)	5	-3.50	210	4.92	11,769
C.....	4,370	C.....	4,800	430	9.84	C.....	4,580		(218.50)	5	-8.50	210	4.81	21,538

¹ Present law, Public Law 134, June 6, 1945, as amended, provides for 9 automatic grades and 3 longevity grades acquired after 13, 18, and 25 years' service, A, B, C.

² H. R. 1592 and S. 1 proposes no change in existing grades under Public Law 134.

³ H. R. 1592 and S. 1 provides for a 10-percent increase, with \$400 minimum, then rounded off to nearest \$100 multiple.

⁴ Overall average increase in H. R. 1592 and S. 1 is 11.35 percent.

⁵ H. R. 2987 and S. 773 proposes to eliminate present grades 1 and 9, thus establishing 7 new automatic grades; present longevity grades A, B, and C remain.

⁶ H. R. 2987 and S. 773 proposes these dollar increases on enactment of the bill.

⁷ Adjustments to be made 6 months after passage of bill.

⁸ Overall average increase in H. R. 2987 and S. 773 is 6.67 percent.

⁹ Total regular positions shown, 89,668. There are additional 32,081 part-time (substitute) letter carriers for whom no in-grade breakdown is available.

¹⁰ Source: Basic Pay Data, U. S. Civil Service Commission, December 1954.

USE OF SECRET ACCUSERS IN GOVERNMENT SECURITY CASES

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the body of the RECORD an article written by Mr. Murrey Marder and published in the Washington Post and Times Herald of March 4, 1955, bearing on the use of secret accusers in Government security cases.

It is significant that the distinguished Solicitor General of the United States, Simon E. Sobeloff, has not joined in the appeal of the Government's case to the Supreme Court.

Mr. President, I think that the right of an accused person to face his accusers is one of the things which, throughout history, has distinguished liberty-loving lands from tyrannies like Nazi Germany and Soviet Russia.

The star chamber is more appropriately associated with the Nazi swastika

and the Soviet hammer and sickle, than it is with the free-flying American eagle.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

UNITED STATES PLEADS FOR SECRET ACCUSERS—BROWNELL URGES SUPREME COURT TO UPHOLD POLICY IN SECURITY CASES
(By Murrey Marder)

The Eisenhower administration told the Supreme Court yesterday that to grant accused persons the right to confront secret accusers in loyalty-security cases might endanger the national security.

In a new test case, the Government said that the same procedure employed under the Truman administration must be maintained to preserve the identity of confidential informants.

This position was vigorously set forth in a 120-page brief signed by Attorney General Herbert Brownell, Jr., and three Assistant Attorneys General.

They urged the High Court to uphold the 1953 dismissal of Dr. John P. Peters as a con-

sultant to the United States Public Health Service, on grounds that there was "reasonable doubt" of his loyalty.

The case arose under the Truman loyalty program. But the confrontation-of-accusers issue is also basic to the Eisenhower Federal employees security program, and the industrial security and other present programs. Three years ago, in the Dorothy Bailey case, the Supreme Court split 4 to 4 on this point, upholding the Government.

There had been considerable speculation about the position the Government would take in the present brief. Its filing was delayed several weeks, with reports of a split in official opinion.

Significantly, the name of Solicitor General Simon E. Sobeloff, the Government's chief spokesman before the Supreme Court, does not appear on the brief, and he will not participate in the arguments.

When asked for comment, Sobeloff issued a carefully worded statement which was most meaningful in what it failed to state. He said:

"The Attorney General and I are in complete understanding about the matter,

There is no requirement that the Solicitor General shall sign a brief filed in the Supreme Court, particularly when the Attorney General signs. There are precedents for this."

He added, "If you wish further comment, you might see the Attorney General." A spokesman for Brownell said he felt no further statement was necessary.

The "understanding" clearly did not mean "agreement" on the case. Sobeloff, who has spoken frequently on constitutional rights, has in the past expressed concern about the concept of "averting national dangers by surrendering some of our liberties to save the rest."

In the Supreme Court the case is expected to be argued by Assistant Attorney General Warren E. Burger, Chief of the Civil Division, who signed the brief along with Assistant Attorneys General William F. Tompkins, head of the Internal Security Division, and J. Lee Rankin.

Dr. Peters, who is senior professor of medicine at Yale University, had occupied a Government consultant job that was non-sensitive from a security standpoint.

He was twice cleared of loyalty charges, including the charge that he was a Communist. But in May 1953, just before the present program went into effect, he was notified that the Loyalty Review Board had adjudged him a loyalty risk.

ANONYMITY DEFENDED

In his case—as in the Bailey case and most cases under these programs—he was not given the names of his accusers or permitted to cross-examine them.

The Justice Department said in its brief: "A large area of vital Government intelligence depends on undercover agents, paid informers, and casual informers who must be guaranteed anonymity."

"Thus, evidence which would be rejected under established legal doctrine in a criminal proceeding could well be the compelling reason for dismissal of an employee on loyalty grounds. An agency head or a loyalty board which would not give weight to information satisfactorily evaluated would be derelict in their respective duties."

"In addition to information from confidential informants," the brief continued, "a large percentage of the material included in the reports under the loyalty and security program is derived from the use of extremely delicate and confidential techniques."

DEPARTMENT'S ARGUMENT

This means, the Department said, that such information, often developed as by-products of major espionage and sabotage investigations, is frequently included in reports on employee cases.

Therefore, said the brief, "professional" and "casual" sources of information "might well dry up, to the detriment of the basic security of the country, if petitioner's contention as to his overriding rights of confrontation and cross-examination were to be honored."

The Department said that "Never in our history has a Government employee been granted a judicial trial or a quasi-judicial administrative hearing upon his dismissal from office."

"Insofar as petitioner has been injured by the stigma to his reputation," it said, "we see no basis for holding that stigma is a thing apart, which gives rise to constitutional rights not applicable to other dismissals from Government service."

"The difference in harm resulting from a dismissal on loyalty grounds and a dismissal for offenses of serious moral turpitude is a difference in degree, not in kind."

"It might be equally difficult for one dismissed because of the acceptance of bribes, theft, sex offenses, or even incompetence, to obtain suitable employment elsewhere."

The Department said that "it is well settled that due process is not a technical conception with a fixed content unrelated to time, place, and circumstances."

POLICY HELD REASONABLE

The Government's program has been "reasonable," said the brief, and must be looked at in respect to the possible espionage and fifth column activities which the techniques of the Communists threaten.

Unlike a criminal trial, the Department said, the Government in dealing with the Federal service "is not required to wit for proof; it may properly insist that Government employees be above suspicion."

Dr. Peters, in his brief filed by the Washington firm of Arnold, Fortas & Porter, contended:

"The issue is solely the use of star-chamber methods to impose on nonsensitive employees the stigma of a dishonorable discharge and disqualification from Government service."

In the 3 years since the Bailey case, Dr. Peters' attorneys said, the consequences of this procedure have become clear.

PROCESS CALLED LOTTERY

"A trial without due process," they said, "is at best a lottery on which no man should be asked to stake his career and reputation. But this particular lottery is not even a fair gambling device."

The CIO, which has filed a friend of the court brief, said in it that, "What began as a Federal employees loyalty program has * * * found its way into all types of employment throughout the land" with repercussions on millions of citizens, which it asked the court to weigh in reaching its decision."

Other briefs have been filed in the case by the American Civil Liberties Union and the Engineers and Scientists of America. No date has yet been set for oral arguments.

SENATOR WALTER F. GEORGE, OF GEORGIA

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I am somewhat embarrassed in what I am about to say, but I think now is as good a time as any to say it. I wish to take a few moments today to pay tribute to one of the truly great men of our time, a man we all have the honor to be associated with, and to call our colleague. I refer to the President pro tempore, WALTER F. GEORGE, senior Senator from Georgia.

Senator GEORGE is at the height of a brilliant career of service to his Nation and State. Chairman of the Committee on Foreign Relations, and a Senator for 32 years, he holds an almost unique position in this great legislative body. He is a symbol of everything fine in the traditions of the United States Senate.

WALTER GEORGE is a man to whom we all, Democrats and Republicans alike, look for advice and counsel in times of crisis. When he speaks, we listen. It is rare, indeed, to have a man of such great qualities in our midst, the undisputed dean among his Democratic colleagues, and a true bipartisan in matters of foreign policy and national security.

At this point in my remarks, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a fine tribute paid to a great man, taken from the St. Louis Post-Dispatch of February 27, 1955, entitled "GEORGE, of Georgia."

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

GEORGE, OF GEORGIA, FOREIGN RELATIONS CHAIRMAN, A SENATOR FOR 32 YEARS—THE MAN ROOSEVELT WANTED TO PURGE NOW AT PINNACLE OF HIS CAREER—AT AGE 77 HE IS AN INSTITUTION IN WASHINGTON—GOT CONGRATULATIONS, THANKS FROM PRESIDENT EISENHOWER FOR BIPARTISAN SUPPORT

(By Edward F. Woods)

WASHINGTON, February 26.—When courtly WALTER FRANKLIN GEORGE, of Georgia, moves down the center aisle of the United States Senate Chamber he leaves the impression that he owns the place, or at least is about to bid on it.

If GEORGE exudes something of a proprietary interest in the meeting place of the world's greatest legislative body, he may be pardoned. For 32 years and 3 months as of Washington's birthday the Chamber has periodically trembled at the impact of his powerful voice.

In that time he has become the undisputed dean of his Democratic colleagues. He is credited with being the only man in the Senate who can switch votes by making a speech. He has collided openly with two Presidents within his own party and today is openly a favorite of a Republican Chief Executive.

Now, in the twilight of his career, the 77-year-old Georgian has reached the pinnacle. He no longer is regarded as just another Senator. He has become an institution, taking his place in history along with the late Senators William E. Borah and Hiram Johnson. In a sense he has become the custodian of Senate traditions and the Senate's way of doing things.

As the Democratic chairman of a Democratic-controlled Foreign Relations Committee he is the Nation's most important instrument for effectuating the foreign policy of President Eisenhower. In this, he has inherited the role of the late Arthur H. Vandenberg, the Republican Senator from Michigan, who was an effective collaborator in the Roosevelt-Truman foreign policy.

GEORGE now is above legislative pulling and hauling. He is not what is known here as a cloakroom trader. Lobbyists shrink in horror at the thought of buttonholing him. While he is not a member of the Democratic policy committee, Senator LYNDON JOHNSON, of Texas, the majority leader, confers with him for 20 minutes to a half hour each noon hour as the Senate convenes, clearing with him such decisions as the policy committee may have reached on pending business.

His influence is such that it is hard to conceive of a coalition of which he was a member being beaten on any issue, though it did happen once. That was last year when Senator THOMAS C. HENNING, JR., of Missouri, a warm admirer of GEORGE, led a floor fight against the George amendments to limit the power of the President to make executive agreements with foreign governments.

To the amazement of his colleagues, Senator HENNING engaged in toe-to-toe debate with the distinguished Georgian and the amendment was beaten by the margin of one vote.

Senator GEORGE's hold on his colleagues stems from two major sources: His age and tenure—and his voice and imperiously paternal bearing.

He makes a speech only when he has something very important to say, a rare quality in the Senate. On these occasions he could spellbind a rooster. He generally opens on a conversational tone, his pleasant southern accent washing soothingly over his listeners.

Then without warning, his voice hardens into a thundering rumble, one fist goes high

over his head, soon followed by the second and then down they both come as scorn and passionate indignation are commingled in a harsh finale intended to cast into outer darkness the issue or the person which is his target.

Senator GEORGE actually began to achieve the status of an institution in the last Congress, which was Republican-controlled, fashioning an astounding unity among the diverse Democratic elements on two major issues.

In one instance, Senator GEORGE did not approve of the way an Eisenhower appointee to the National Labor Relations Board, Albert C. Beeson, had failed to fully and frankly inform the Senate Labor Committee of a private pension arrangement he had with his former employer. GEORGE let it be known that he would vote against Senate confirmation of Beeson. On the rollcall only two Democrats failed to fall in line with him.

Later he likewise made known that he was in favor of recommitting to committee, or killing off, the administration-sponsored revisions in the Taft-Hartley law. On this rollcall every Democrat joined him. It was the first time in history of their party that the Democrats, who usually claw each other on labor union issues, voted unanimously on such a question.

His crowning achievement, however, came last January 28 when, as chairman of the Foreign Relations Committee, he guided the administration's resolution on defense of Formosa to a whopping 85-to-2 victory in the Senate. Nary a Democrat strayed on the rollcall and GEORGE achieved a noteworthy milestone in the conduct of bipartisanship in the cold war.

Senator GEORGE used forceful language in support of that resolution, declaring:

"I hope that no Democrat will be heard to say that because the President of the United States came to Congress he is thereby subject to criticism.

"He chose a courageous course, a course which would be taken only by a prudent man who knows the pitfalls along the course and who knows the horrors of war.

"No person can guarantee the results of any important public act. We cannot. But there is no man who is worth his salt . . . who is not willing to exercise his best judgment, his honest judgment in response to the President."

It is no secret that many Democrats found the calling for the defense of Formosa and its current tenant, Chiang Kai-shek, grossly unpalatable. And while the resolution undoubtedly would have passed anyway, the opinion here is that GEORGE alone was responsible for the overwhelming assent. GEORGE's vigorous support of the resolution was viewed by some as justifying claims during the 1954 campaign that a Democratic congressional victory would help rather than hinder Mr. Eisenhower in foreign policy matters.

President Eisenhower was so elated over the vote that he sent GEORGE a note describing his leadership on the Formosa resolution as superb and offering his congratulations and grateful thanks. The following day, Secretary of State Dulles personally conducted GEORGE from his suite at the Mayflower Hotel to the White House to take part in the signing ceremonies. It was GEORGE's 77th birthday.

There are some here who say privately that Eisenhower and Dulles are simply using GEORGE to push projects which are not compounded on a true bipartisan basis. He rejects such contentions, asserting that the Eisenhower-Dulles approach to bipartisanship on foreign policy is genuine and complete. He attributes to the White House no disposition to confront the Democratic leadership with decisions already made.

Senator GEORGE's influence is by no means confined to passage or defeat of legislation. In this city where foot-in-mouth disease is rampant, 44-year-old Majority Leader JOHNSON frankly exults that some of the dean's aloofness and reserve has rubbed off on him, thus restraining him from popping off to the press as does the minority leader, Senator WILLIAM F. KNOWLAND, of California.

With more than 32 years tenure behind him, Senator GEORGE is the fourth most durable man in Senate history. Ranking him in this respect were South Carolina's Ellison D. Smith and Iowa's William B. Allison, each of whom served 35 years and 5 months, and Wyoming's Francis E. Warren, who was a Senator for 37 years and 5 days.

Some of the Senator's critics regard him as an arch conservative. He calls himself a liberal, but a liberal within the Constitution.

GEORGE was born January 29, 1878, at Preston, Ga., the son of a tenant farmer. His childhood was one of hard work and privation. He acquired a one-room-schoolhouse elementary education and eventually went through Mercer University and into a successful law practice.

He became a judge and rose from the lower courts to the State supreme court. A studious and scholarly man, he devoted long hours to the history of the Constitution and its interpretation, strengthening his concept of the rights of the States and localities against potentially oppressive powers of a central government.

In 1922, firebranding Senator Tom Watson, of Georgia, died and GEORGE got the nod from Georgia business and utility interests to run for the vacant seat. His views have undergone some startling changes since then.

In a scorching 1922 campaign, GEORGE roundly denounced the League of Nations and all such foreign entanglements. He criticized the soldier bonus and proposed liberalization of immigration laws. The Volstead Act, he preached, should have stiffer penalties for illicit dealing in spirits.

Four years later, however, in the next primary campaign, his enemies attacked him for having voted for the World Court and, in 1928, after receiving 52½ national convention votes for the Democratic presidential nomination, he was supporting that implacable foe of prohibition, Al Smith, for President, and was denouncing the Volstead Act as a Federal invasion of a domain where it has no business to be—the regulation of a private citizen's habits and wishes.

In 1932, GEORGE opposed the nomination of Franklin D. Roosevelt for President, a misdeed which Roosevelt never forgot. However, after Roosevelt's election, GEORGE voted for NRA, AAA, TVA, SEC, and social security. He bridled against regulation of utility holding companies, the New Deal housing bill, and Roosevelt's plan to enlarge or as some put it, to pack, the Supreme Court. He energetically, but without success, fought the 1936 tax bill which included a levy on the undistributed profits of corporations.

His opposition to so much New Deal legislation earned him the hostility of the White House and President Roosevelt marked him for a political purge.

The President journeyed to Gainesville, Ga., in 1938 and with GEORGE seated behind him on the speaker's platform he informed the Peach State's citizens that he wanted GEORGE defeated in the upcoming primary. When the President finished, GEORGE got up, shook his hand, expressed his regrets over the President's position, and added:

"Mr. President, I accept the challenge."

He fought the President up and down his State in the best southern political tradition. He denounced outside interference, carpetbaggers, and another march to the sea. When he concluded his speeches a brass band rendered Dixie, and tears flowed.

In the voting, GEORGE won, thus becoming the hero of the anti-New Dealers. He polled 141,922 votes to 102,264 for Eugene Talmadge and 78,223 for Roosevelt's hapless candidate, Lawrence Camp.

In 1949, GEORGE found himself at loggerheads with another Democratic President; Harry S. Truman, over the President's plan to raise taxes to cover spending contemplated in the Fair Deal program and still keep the budget balanced. GEORGE thought the budget could be balanced by slashing Truman's spending plans and leaving taxes at their current levels.

GEORGE concedes that during the war years he was reputed, undeservedly, to have been unduly tender with corporations and wealthy people in tax matters as chairman of the Senate Finance Committee.

But a year ago he rose in wrath against the whittling away of tax exemptions for lower bracket income taxpayers, and he horrified his more conservative followers with a proposal that exemptions for dependents be increased immediately from \$600 to \$800 and eventually to \$1,000. This bombshell failed to detonate.

When he is not fulfilling his function as pivot man in legislative and policy matters, GEORGE confines himself to his Mayflower Hotel rooms where he and his wife, whom he calls Miss Lucy, watch television and read. His habits are simple and he regards even White House receptions as above and beyond the call of duty.

In view of GEORGE's advanced age, it is no secret that several Georgia politicians are wondering when he will step down and give somebody else a chance, because no one will have the chance unless he gives it to him.

Asked if he might quit in 1956 and support Herman Talmadge as his successor, GEORGE replied:

"I do not know if I can support anybody at that time. I am somewhat in the position of an old friend of mine in Savannah who said that when he died he wished to be carried back to Savannah to be buried because every 2 years they would resurrect him at election time so he could vote. I do not know who would be my redeemer in such circumstances, and, therefore, I do not know whom I would vote for."

Mr. THYE. Mr. President, I wish to associate myself with the remarks of the distinguished Senator from Montana [Mr. MANSFIELD] paying tribute to the distinguished President pro tempore of the Senate, the Senator from Georgia [Mr. GEORGE], who is now occupying the chair.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, I should like to say that the junior Senator from Missouri is most gratified that the St. Louis Post-Dispatch had the wisdom to pay deserved tribute, as it did in the article presented by the junior Senator from Montana, to the distinguished senior Senator from Georgia and President pro tempore of the Senate, WALTER F. GEORGE.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. If the Chair may be permitted to do so, he desires to thank both the Senator from Montana, the Senator from Minnesota, and the Senator from Missouri for their generous references to him.

MEETING IN WASHINGTON OF NATIONAL BOARD MEMBERS OF FEDERATION OF REPUBLICAN WOMEN

Mr. DIRKSEN. Mr. President, I should like to take about a minute to call attention to a meeting which took

place in Washington during the past 3 or 4 days of a very dedicated group of women who are the national board members of an organization known as the Federation of Republican Women. They operate through 4,000 units or chapters and represent 500,000 women in the Republican Party.

While, of course, they are affiliated with a political institution, the Republican Party, they, nevertheless, serve an extremely useful purpose in that they direct the attention of people everywhere to issues that constitute challenges at home and abroad. So I think I should commend the service they render to our country and their fellow citizens.

They held a very constructive conference and seminar in the Nation's Capital, which included, among other things, addresses by Members of the Senate, visits to agencies of Government, and also a visit with the President of the United States.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. Is there further morning business? If not, morning business is closed.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL TRADE AND ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1954

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I move that the Senate proceed to the consideration of Calendar No. 43, Senate bill 752.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The bill will be stated by title, for the information of the Senate.

The LEGISLATIVE CLERK. A bill to amend section 102 (a) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, so as to eliminate the requirement that privately owned stocks exported thereunder be replaced from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks.

The PRESIDENT pro tempore. The question is on agreeing to the motion of the Senator from Kentucky.

The motion was agreed to; and the Senate proceeded to consider the bill, which had been reported from the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry with an amendment.

SENATOR MAGNUSON, OF WASHINGTON

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, on Friday last my distinguished senior colleague, Senator WARREN G. MAGNUSON, was given a testimonial dinner at our State capital, Olympia, Wash. The dinner was in honor of Senator MAGNUSON's 25 years of devoted public service, and was arranged by distinguished members of the State legislature. It was attended by outstanding leaders from all over the State. On this occasion he received congratulatory messages from national leaders in business, labor, and civic affairs.

Mr. President, it has been my distinct honor to be closely associated with Senator MAGNUSON during 15 of his 25 years of brilliant public service. He first entered public life in 1930, when he was appointed special prosecuting attorney for King County, Wash. Two years later he was elected to the State legislature,

where he quickly became one of the leaders of that body. In 1934 he was elected prosecuting attorney of his home county. In 1936 he became the second Democrat ever to have been elected to the Congress from what is now the First Congressional District. He served continuously in the House of Representatives until he was elected to the Senate in 1944. He was reelected in 1950, and is now 13th in seniority in the United States Senate.

At the present time, Senator MAGNUSON is serving as chairman of the Interstate and Foreign Commerce Committee. This is the first major chairmanship a Senator from the State of Washington has held since 1931, at which time Senator Wesley Jones terminated his service as chairman of the old Senate Commerce Committee.

Senator MAGNUSON is the senior member of the delegation from our State, and members of both parties in the State of Washington owe a debt of gratitude to him for his leadership, inspiration, and constant help.

Mr. President, I know of no one who has been more cooperative in working for the interests of our State and the Nation than has WARREN MAGNUSON. His long years of public service constitute one of the most valuable assets the people of the State of Washington have. As the junior Senator from Washington, I am honored indeed on this occasion to join with the people of our State in extending to him every good wish.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

Mr. JACKSON. I am happy to yield to my distinguished colleague from Kentucky.

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I desire to join with my colleagues in this well-deserved salute to our good friend and able public servant from Washington, the senior Senator from that State, WARREN MAGNUSON.

It is not without reason that he is celebrating his silver anniversary in public life. Such celebrations do not just happen. In our democracy the voice of the people is heard, and when they find wanting a public servant whom they have elected they retire him from public service long before he has completed 25 years of service.

The people of Washington have not found WARREN MAGNUSON wanting. He is an outstanding western legislator. He loves the West and fights for the West, as he fights for the Nation. Instinctively he is on the side of the people. His service to the Nation during the past 25 years covers the most tumultuous period in our history. Through depression, war, and cold war, WARREN MAGNUSON has measured up in every way to the public trust.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EASTLAND in the chair). Does the Senator from Washington yield to the Senator from Alabama?

Mr. JACKSON. I am very happy to yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Alabama.

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I wish to say how happy I am to have heard these

fine tributes to the distinguished senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], both the tribute by his colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], and that couched in the eloquent words of our acting Democratic leader, the distinguished senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS].

For a number of years it has been my pleasure and my privilege to serve with the senior Senator from Washington in the Senate, and previously I served with him in the House of Representatives. I know how able, how devoted, and how brilliant he is. I know the fine leadership he displays in working, laboring, and fighting for the advancement of the programs designed to promote the welfare and the happiness of all the people.

I congratulate the State of Washington on having two such brilliant and outstanding Senators as Senator MAGNUSON and Senator JACKSON.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to my distinguished colleague the junior Senator from Montana.

Mr. MANSFIELD. Mr. President, I wish to join with my colleague and longtime friend the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], as well as with the acting majority leader, the senior Senator from Kentucky [Mr. CLEMENTS], and the senior Senator from Alabama [Mr. HILL] in the compliments they are bestowing this day on the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON].

I, too, have had the pleasure of serving in the House of Representatives with him, and I wish to say that, in my opinion, he is one of the great men the Northwest has produced, and that those of us who come from that area in particular look to him for leadership, advice, and counsel.

I am happy that he has completed 25 years of public service in the public good; and I only hope that the next 25 years will see a continuation of the outstanding activities of this man, who has represented so well his State and the Nation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. EASTLAND in the chair). Let the present occupant of the Chair state that for many years he has served on the Judiciary Committee with the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON], who has been an outstanding member of that committee.

From the Chair's observation, the Chair does not believe that any other Member of Congress has succeeded in having passed more legislation of benefit to his people and the people of the Nation than has the senior Senator from Washington. Senator MAGNUSON is a distinguished Member of this body who has made great accomplishments for his State, for the great western region, and for the Nation; and the Chair hopes for him many more years of successful public service.

Mr. NEUBERGER. Mr. President, will the Senator from Washington yield to me?

Mr. JACKSON. I am glad to yield to the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER].

Mr. NEUBERGER. I thank the Senator from Washington very much.

Mr. President, I should like to speak very briefly and associate myself with the tribute being paid to the senior Senator from the State of Washington, WARREN MAGNUSON.

Mr. President, no other two States have problems which are more closely related and are more in common than do the States of Oregon and Washington, which share the great Columbia River, the principal resource of the Pacific Northwest.

Whenever there has been a question of whether the resources of that area should be developed in the public interest or for special interests, the senior Senator from Washington, WARREN G. MAGNUSON, has always been found fighting for the public interest. For example, within the next 2 weeks there will be introduced proposed legislation, bearing the names of many Members of this body, providing for the public, Federal multipurpose development of Hells Canyon, the greatest hydroelectric-power site left on the North American Continent. Everyone knows, so it is almost unnecessary to state, that in the forefront of that battle will be found the senior Senator from Washington. Long before I came to this body, I was writing about such developments in the Pacific Northwest; I believe I wrote the first magazine article about Grand Coulee Dam, in Harper's magazine. Even then, I found WARREN MAGNUSON, as a member of his State legislature, taking wise leadership in the fight for the proper development of the resources of the Pacific Northwest.

I wish to say that my senior colleague from the State of Oregon [Mr. MORSE] has asked me to express for him, as well as on behalf of myself, our gratitude to the State of Washington, our neighboring State across the Columbia River, for sending to the Senate so able a senior Senator as WARREN G. MAGNUSON, who has taken such keen and outstanding an interest in the problems of both States.

I appreciate very much indeed, Mr. President, the courtesy of the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON] in yielding to me at this time.

Mr. JACKSON. I now yield to the distinguished junior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. GORE].

Mr. GORE. Mr. President, it is worthy of consideration by his colleagues in the Senate that the State of Washington has recognized in a formal way the outstanding service, noble character, and fine talents of its distinguished senior Senator [Mr. MAGNUSON]. Such recognition certainly has the approval of all his colleagues.

Having served with WARREN MAGNUSON in both Houses of Congress for 17 years, I feel that I know the man, and know the statesman.

The junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] has just referred to his consistent fight for the development of the resources of the Northwest in the public interest. I can testify to the correctness of the statements of the junior Senator from Oregon; but I should like

to broaden the scope of the description of the service of the senior Senator from Washington. I have seen him fight for the development of the resources of the entire country, for the benefit of all the people. In 17 years I have never known of WARREN MAGNUSON, either as a Representative in Congress or as a Senator, taking either a niggardly or a niggling attitude. He possesses the ability to recognize the national interest. It is his philosophy that a program which is good for the New England section of the United States is likewise good for his section of America, and, indeed, for all America. He has viewed the problems confronting him and his colleagues during the vexatious years of his service in that light, and has brought to both Houses of Congress and to the leadership of his State the kind of vision, courage, and warm human compassion that we seldom see.

The senior Senator from Washington is a proper subject of honor, and it is well that his service should be accorded proper honor. As he goes on through the years in the fullness of his manhood, serving still further and with greater ability and increased strength, we shall see him become more renowned. The able assistance, fine enthusiasm, and outstanding ability of his brilliant junior colleague will add not only to his stature, but the stature and renown of the State of Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I now yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Tennessee [Mr. KEFAUVER].

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I am honored to follow my colleague from Tennessee in saying a few words about the distinguished senior Senator from Washington, WARREN MAGNUSON.

I became a Member of the House of Representatives in 1939, and came to know the then Representative MAGNUSON. We have been very close personal friends since those days, both in the House of Representatives, and later in the United States Senate.

Senator MAGNUSON knows how to get along with his colleagues in both Houses of Congress, and he always maintains a very friendly attitude toward members of the executive department of the Government.

One thing which should be pointed out is that the two Senators from Washington constitute a wonderful team, working not only for the welfare of the Nation, but for the development of the great Pacific Northwest. They have always worked together. They have supported each other as Representatives from the State of Washington, and they have stood together as Senators for the advancement of that great area.

No section of the United States has made more remarkable progress agriculturally than has the Pacific Northwest. Land is being reclaimed, irrigated, and developed. Large areas, which not many years ago were arid, have come into cultivation. Rivers are being harnessed. Mineral resources are being utilized. New industries have been brought to the Pacific Northwest.

I think one of the main reasons why this great development has taken place has been the excellent leadership which

the senior Senator from Washington has given in all efforts looking toward a greater Northwest. In these efforts, he has been joined by his distinguished colleague, the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON].

As my junior colleague [Mr. GORE] has said, the senior Senator from Washington not only thinks about the Pacific Northwest but appreciates the importance of developing all the resources of the entire Nation. In our fight for the Tennessee Valley Authority, we have had no better friends than the Senators from Washington and their associates from the State of Oregon.

I have served on several committees with the senior Senator from Washington. He knows how to get things done. He presents his facts in a quiet but forceful way. Many times in committees and on the floor of the Senate, as well as the House of Representatives, I have seen him present an amendment which might have seemed minor, but which would prove to be very important in promoting the development and progress of a great section, and his point would usually prevail.

It should also be pointed out that he has always been a great friend of Alaska. I think the Alcan Highway and the development of many of the resources of Alaska, bringing this great Territory closer to our country, have been the result of his foresight, his devotion, and his energy.

I feel that the important Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce of the Senate, with its wide jurisdiction over the transportation and communication systems of our country, is very fortunate in having as its chairman this young man of great ability, energy, and experience, with the know-how which he has acquired over the years. In my opinion, he will be one of the great chairmen of all time of the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

Not only have the people of the Pacific Northwest been fortunate in having the two present Senators from Washington representing them in legislative bodies in the Nation's Capital during all these years, but I think they have made a notable contribution to the general welfare of the United States.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I now yield to the distinguished Senator from Oklahoma [Mr. MONRONEY].

Mr. MONRONEY. Mr. President, I thank the distinguished junior Senator from Washington.

Mr. President, it is always a great satisfaction to realize that a State which has been ably served for a quarter of a century officially recognizes the distinguished and outstanding service of one of its public servants. It is even more gratifying to note that the distinguished servant so honored is in the legislative branch of the Government, because in that field it is sometimes harder to leave a lasting impact than it is in the other two branches of Government, the judiciary and the executive.

We who serve with Senator MAGNUSON, the senior Senator from Washington, are gratified to know that the people of his home community, of his home State, in

the great Northwest, recognize and appreciate his greatness as much as do those of us who have served with him in the House of Representatives and in the Senate.

It has been my privilege to serve with Senator MAGNUSON for 17 years. I know the great impact he made in his efforts to give America a first-rate merchant marine, in order to provide the ships that were necessary for us to win victory in World War II. I know what he has done for the development of the natural resources of the Pacific Northwest.

I also know of the great faith and understanding he has in the leadership that has come to him officially in the present Congress through the chairmanship of one of the most important committees of the United States Senate. I refer to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce, which has widespread jurisdiction over many important resources and developments, including communications and transportation.

Senator MAGNUSON is well qualified to perform those tasks. He has been well qualified to perform all the other great services he has rendered in Congress, as a member of the Committee on Appropriations and of other committees. His work has been outstanding. Therefore, I am glad to join with my colleagues in expressing appreciation of the wonderful recognition, deservedly due him, accorded him by the people of his home State on the 25th anniversary of his legislative service.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I now yield to the junior Senator from Missouri.

Mr. SYMINGTON. Mr. President, it has been my privilege to know Senator MAGNUSON for many years. Ever since I became a junior Member of the Senate, he has gone out of his way to show kindness to me and to give me the benefit of wise counsel, for which I have always been very grateful.

I am glad to note that the people and the legislature of his home State are according him the honor which is justly his due.

Although Senator MAGNUSON is perhaps known primarily in the Northwest as one who is interested in such outstanding projects as public power and the development of American maritime interests, I first knew him when he was interested equally as much in airpower.

Few people realize that most of the bombers which have helped to build up our airpower in recent years were designed and most of them built in Seattle, Wash. The greatest bomber of its day, the B-17, followed by the B-29, which was built toward the end of World War II, then the B-50, and now the new intercontinental jet bomber, the B-52, were all either designed or built in the State of Washington.

I believe that Senator MAGNUSON has shown as much understanding of airpower as has any other Member of the Senate.

When I was connected with the Air Force, his advice and assistance were of great help to all in that branch of the service.

For these and many other reasons, it is with a great deal of pleasure and re-

spect that I join my colleagues in extending congratulations to our dear friend and colleague, Senator WARREN MAGNUSON.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I now yield to the distinguished junior Senator from Georgia.

Mr. RUSSELL. Mr. President, I wish to avail myself of this opportunity to associate myself with the Senators who have spoken words of congratulation and of commendation to the distinguished senior Senator from Washington upon the completion by him of a quarter of a century of public service.

It has been my privilege to serve on the Committee on Appropriations with Senator MAGNUSON and to have been associated with him on the floor of the Senate since he first became a Member of the Senate. I know of his earnest and unfaltering interest in the development and conservation of the natural resources of the United States. I worked with him on legislation which affects the agricultural interests of the Nation. I know that no one would refer to his public service without mentioning his contribution to the maritime industry and the development of electric power.

It is unusual for one to have served 25 years and still to be a comparatively young man. It is even more unusual for one of Senator MAGNUSON's age to have attained the seniority he has attained in the Senate. I believe he is 13th in seniority in the Senate. His long service has brought to him increasing responsibilities in the form of the chairmanship of one of the most important committees of the Senate, as well as by way of membership on other committees. All of us understand what seniority means in this body.

I congratulate Senator MAGNUSON, and I commend those in his home State who have honored him on this eventful anniversary. I congratulate the great State of Washington and the great Northwest and these United States upon the assurance that they will have the benefit of Senator MAGNUSON's service, predicated, as it is, upon broad experience in the Senate, for many years to come.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I yield to the senior Senator from Oregon.

Mr. MORSE. Mr. President, it is a high privilege and a great pleasure for me to join in paying tribute to Senator MAGNUSON, of Washington. The State of Washington is very fortunate in being represented in the Senate of the United States by two such distinguished and aggressive men as Senator MAGNUSON and Senator JACKSON.

In the tributes which have been paid, enumeration has been made of the legislative enactments to which Senator MAGNUSON has made notable contributions during his 25 years of public service.

I wish to say a word concerning his activities on behalf of the farmers of the State of Washington. I do not know of anyone in the Senate who has been more cognizant of the problems of the farmers, particularly those of the great Northwest, than has Senator MAGNUSON, ably assisted by his colleague, Senator JACKSON. I wish particularly to refer to the work he has done in the field of the fruit industry in the Pacific Northwest—leg-

islation of benefit to the fruit industry he has introduced and has had passed. He has insisted invariably that in connection with our foreign trade program we should not follow a course of action which would amount in effect to uprooting thousands of acres of orchards. That is what would happen if the profits were taken out of that enterprise; and it would have happened except for the very effective work done by Senator MAGNUSON and his colleague and other Senators, one of whom I see on the floor, the Senator from Florida [Mr. HOLLAND], all of whom have worked together on the problems which have confronted the fruit industry of the Nation. Senator MAGNUSON has a great record of true friendship for the farmers of his State and of the country, but always on the merits of the issue, not on the basis of seeking to get something to which the farmers are not actually entitled.

The Senator from Missouri [Mr. SYMINGTON] has mentioned the fact that the senior Senator from Washington has made notable contributions in the field of aviation. I have worked with him, as the junior Senator from Washington knows, in connection with aviation problems pertaining to Alaska and the Hawaiian Islands. His fine record on that issue speaks for itself, as does his record in regard to Air Force defense. He and his colleague [Mr. JACKSON] represent a great State of the Pacific Northwest, the State of Washington, as the junior Senator from Oregon [Mr. NEUBERGER] and I represent the State of Oregon. We are aware of the threat posed by the tongue of Siberia which is sticking out at us across the very narrow maritime area near Nome, Alaska. We know who would be hit first if the Russian air might should ever leave Siberia or Big Diamede, and start toward the United States. When we read the RECORD we become cognizant that the senior Senator from Washington recognizes the importance of strong defenses in that area as well as of strong defenses in the entire Pacific Northwest. The people of our section of the Nation are greatly indebted to the senior Senator from Washington for the work he has done in the field of air defense.

As was mentioned by the Senator from Georgia [Mr. RUSSELL], the senior Senator from Washington has made very valuable contributions with reference to maritime problems. For a long time thousands of workers in the State of Washington have owed a great debt to the senior Senator from Washington so far as their livelihood is concerned. It is my opinion that the shipyards there would not have been developed to the importance which they now have had not the senior Senator from Washington worked so hard in their behalf and in behalf of the workers employed by them.

In the field of power development and irrigation and the maximum development of the natural resources of the Pacific Northwest, he has no peer in the Senate of the United States. It is a great pleasure to me to work shoulder to shoulder with him, as we shall be working together on the floor of the Senate next week on a matter involving a great

natural resource development for the improvement of our section of the country, because the senior Senator from Washington recognizes, as do the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], the Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY], and other Senators, that the economic value of our section of the United States depends upon the development of the maximum potential of its great rivers, such as the Columbia and the Snake.

The senior Senator from Washington has become a symbol, a personification, of the maximum of development of the potentialities of the vast resources of the great Northwest. The people of the State of Washington owe him a very great debt, because his statesmanship has brought benefits to the State of Washington, not in the millions of dollars, Mr. President, but actually in the billions of dollars, when we begin to evaluate his public service over a quarter of a century.

Therefore, Mr. President, because of his record and because it is thrilling to pay tribute to the living, and always sad to pay tribute to the dead, I particularly enjoy this opportunity to pay tribute to a great living statesman, the senior Senator from Washington.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I now yield to the distinguished senior Senator from Montana [Mr. MURRAY].

Mr. MURRAY. Mr. President, I deem it a great honor to have this opportunity to participate in the tributes which are being paid to our distinguished colleague, the senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. I have known him for a great many years. My association with him commenced many years before I came to the Senate of the United States. I visit his State frequently, and when he visits Montana I wish to say that no Senator of the United States is more sincerely welcome in Montana than is the distinguished senior Senator from Washington. We have worked together over the years on problems concerned with the development of the natural resources of the great West. The notable progress which has been made in the Columbia Basin in recent years can be attributed largely to the splendid work of the able senior Senator from Washington and his colleague.

I recall my association with former Senator Bone, of Washington. We traveled through the State of Montana and the State of Washington on many occasions and in the Congress we worked together on power and reclamation projects. In like manner I have been associated with the present senior Senator from Washington and no one has worked more diligently, more effectively, and more efficiently for the program providing for the development of the Columbia Basin, which has brought about such tremendous growth and progress in that section of the country, than has the senior Senator from Washington.

I remember, Mr. President, when I first used to visit Seattle, 50 years ago. The situation was then entirely different from what it is now. There is now a huge power development there which has brought industry into that area in such large volume that it has become one of

the great industrial sections of the United States. It is one of the marvels of American industrial growth.

Mr. President, the work of the senior Senator from Washington in the Senate has had the commendation of every Senator who knows of his able work and effective contributions in connection with the great power, reclamation, and irrigation programs which we have had under consideration here in the Senate over the years.

I deem it a great honor to be able to say these few words in support of my good friend the senior Senator from Washington; and while I am on my feet I wish to extend to his colleague, the junior Senator from Washington [Mr. JACKSON], my sincere felicitations on the splendid work he is doing.

I am proud to be associated with both of those great Senators, Mr. President. They are making vital contributions, not only to the development of their own State, but to the development of the Nation.

Mr. JACKSON. Mr. President, I now yield to the distinguished Senator from Mississippi [Mr. STENNIS].

Mr. STENNIS. Mr. President, I have enjoyed the complimentary statements which have been made concerning the senior Senator from Washington on the anniversary of the start of his public service. He was one of the most active Members of this body when I first came to the Senate. He attracted my attention because of his fine energy, his efforts, his persistence, and insistence on everything pertaining to the development of his particular area and of the country as a whole. Later, as a member of the Public Works Committee, I traveled through portions of that great area including several stops in his wonderful home State, and saw some of the fine results which have been achieved and various projects in which he had had a part.

My impression is that he has been one of the most active Members of the Senate. After all, Mr. President, results are the real test of a Senator; results are what count.

I used jokingly to say to him that I believed he carried around a pocketful of amendments. Regardless of what bill might be under consideration, he could pull an amendment out of his pocket that would change a bill somewhat more to his thinking and his ideas. That is my way of saying that he is active and diligent. There have been a great number of Magnuson amendments, and many of them have prevailed.

I am very glad to join with other Senators who are paying these deserved tributes. I consider the senior Senator from Washington to be a very valuable Member of the Senate.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield?

Mr. JACKSON. I yield to the distinguished senior Senator from North Dakota.

Mr. LANGER. I have been delighted to hear so many of my Democratic colleagues pay tribute to the distinguished senior Senator from Washington [Mr. MAGNUSON]. Senator MAGNUSON is not

a Democrat at all; he is a Theodore Roosevelt-Bob La Follette-George Norris Republican, and has been such all his life.

Senator MAGNUSON was born at Moorhead, Minn., less than half a mile across the Red River from Fargo, N. Dak., and about 24 miles from where I was born. I have known him for most of his life.

Senator MAGNUSON was a student at the University of North Dakota, where he attended the agricultural college. He played quarterback on the football team of the Agricultural College of the University of North Dakota.

Most important of all, when he was practically an orphan, by whom was he educated? By the Republican national committeeman from North Dakota, Mr. William Stern. Mr. Stern was not only chairman of the Republican National Committee, but also for many years was Republican national committeeman from North Dakota, and for a long time Senator MAGNUSON was his protege.

Mr. Stern was responsible not only for Senator MAGNUSON's academic education but also trained him along political lines. The views which Senator MAGNUSON holds about public power, rural electrification, conservation, and similar programs, he received from William Stern, the former head of the Republican Party in North Dakota.

Senator MAGNUSON has done a magnificent job in connection with Alaska. Some time ago he was a member of a subcommittee investigating Federal penitentiaries, and was himself in charge of the investigation of penitentiaries in Alaska and Hawaii. That is a subcommittee which never receives any headlines. A Senator who is a member of that subcommittee will sometimes get up at 3 or 4 o'clock in the morning, go to a penitentiary, and learn at first hand what kind of food the prisoners or inmates are receiving. He investigates the living conditions; he determines whether there has been any discrimination among inmates in connection with their civil liberties. He investigates also the conditions of solitary confinement to which inmates may be subjected.

Senator MAGNUSON did excellent work in the investigation of prisons in Alaska, particularly the prison at Anchorage, a wooden building in which the lives of the inmates were endangered during their entire terms of confinement. The structure was a disgrace to the United States. Senator MAGNUSON succeeded in having the present fireproof building erected.

Senator MAGNUSON performed magnificent work in the development of Northwest Airlines, which started at Minneapolis and St. Paul and continued across the Pacific Ocean to Alaska and Hawaii. I was delighted to learn a few days ago, after the President had issued an order practically barring Northwest Airlines from flying to Hawaii, that through the diligent efforts of the distinguished senior Senator from Minnesota [Mr. THYE], who was assisted by the distinguished senior Senator from Washington, the Executive order was revoked. That great airline is now continuing to fly passengers to Alaska and Hawaii.

Senator MAGNUSON, who was a poor boy when he was reared in North Dakota and Minnesota, did every kind of work imaginable on a farm. He shucked corn and bundled wheat. He was an expert operator of a threshing machine. He hauled grain to the elevator. He plowed and harrowed and did every kind of farm work imaginable. Therefore, as a Senator he is intimately acquainted with the problems of farmers, which is perhaps one important reason why he has been so earnestly engaged in trying to solve their problems.

I am delighted that his colleague, the distinguished junior Senator from Washington, has called to our attention the fact that the people of the State of Washington honored Senator MAGNUSON a few days ago by tendering him a dinner commemorating 25 years of distinguished public service. I know that if the people of North Dakota and also, I believe, the people of western Minnesota, had realized that such a dinner was to be given for Senator MAGNUSON, they would have flooded the banquet with telegrams expressing their appreciation for the many things which the senior Senator from Washington has done for the rank and file of the people of those two States.

PROGRAM FOR TUESDAY, MARCH 8

Mr. CLEMENTS. Mr. President, I should like to state the program for next Tuesday, as it is the intention of the acting majority leader to move that the Senate adjourn until that day. On Tuesday, in addition to the call of the Executive Calendar, it is the intention to take up Calendar No. 40, Senate bill 941; Calendar No. 41, Senate bill 942; and Calendar No. 42, Senate bill 1051.

The bills referred to by Mr. CLEMENTS are, respectively, as follows:

S. 941, to amend section 13 of the Federal Farm Loan Act, as amended, to authorize the Federal land banks to purchase certain remaining assets of the Federal Farm Mortgage Corporation;

S. 942, to repeal Public Law 820, 80th Congress (62 Stat. 1098), entitled "An act to provide a revolving fund for the purchase of agricultural commodities and raw materials to be processed in occupied areas and sold; and

S. 1051, to amend section 8a (4) of the Commodity Exchange Act, as amended.

Mr. LANGER. Mr. President, will the Senator yield for a question?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I yield.

Mr. LANGER. May I inquire when House bill 4259, the Revenue Act of 1955, is to be taken up?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I am not in a position at this time to tell the Senator a specific date. However, it is certainly the intention of the acting majority leader to move that bill along as rapidly as possible.

Mr. LANGER. Would the distinguished Senator say that it might be taken up sometime next week?

Mr. CLEMENTS. I do not wish to be placed in that position at present, because there are some other measures on the calendar which likewise have certain priority. However, I can assure the Senator that the revenue bill will not be unduly delayed. It is the intention and

the hope of the acting majority leader that action can be taken on that measure, which is of such vital importance to so many, at the earliest date consistent with the wishes of those on both sides of the aisle with respect to it, and also another bill on the calendar.

AMENDMENT OF AGRICULTURAL TRADE AND ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1954

The Senate resumed the consideration of the bill (S. 752) to amend section 102 (a) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, so as to eliminate the requirement that privately owned stocks exported thereunder be replaced from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks.

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, the unfinished business is S. 752, a bill to repeal the buy-back provision of Public Law 480, which was passed last year. The measure is noncontroversial. It largely affects—in fact, it solely affects—the United States cotton industry.

Under Public Law 480, a cotton shipper, when he sold cotton, was obligated to repurchase from the stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation the same number of bales of cotton, of the same grade, and of the same staple.

The bill under consideration repeals the buy-back provision for the reason that that provision cannot work in the case of cotton.

The world price of cotton and the American price of cotton are about the same. American cotton shippers have found that when they have to buy back from the stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation an amount of cotton equal to that which they have sold, frequently the prices of the Commodity Credit Corporation cotton are 2 or 3 cents a pound above the selling price. That prevents the sale of the cotton.

Then, too, it has been found that frequently the stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation do not contain the same grade and staple of cotton as that which has been exported; therefore, the Commodity Credit Corporation cannot make the sale.

The bill has been endorsed by the Department of Agriculture. Assistant Secretary of Agriculture James A. McConnell testified in favor of it before the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry.

The bill has been endorsed also by the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Cotton Council, the National Grange, and the Cotton Textile Institute. In fact, all the farm organizations and all other organizations concerned have endorsed the bill.

The subcommittee held extensive hearings, and not a single witness appeared in opposition to the measure. The bill is noncontroversial, and I urge its enactment.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The amendment will be stated.

The amendment of the Committee on Agriculture and Forestry was, on page 2, line 11, after the word "amended," to insert:

The commodity set-aside established for any commodity under section 101 of the

Agricultural Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 897), shall be reduced by a quantity equal to the quantity of such commodity financed hereunder which is exported from private stocks.

So as to make the bill read:

Be it enacted, etc., That section 102 (a) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 is amended to read as follows:

"Sec. 102. (a) For the purpose of carrying out agreements concluded by the President hereunder, the Commodity Credit Corporation, in accordance with regulations issued by the President pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, (1) shall make available for sale hereunder to domestic exporters, surplus agricultural commodities heretofore or hereafter acquired by the Corporation in the administration of its price-support operations, and (2) shall make funds available to finance the sale and exportation of surplus agricultural commodities, whether from private stocks or from stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation. In supplying such commodities to exporters under this subsection the Commodity Credit Corporation shall not be subject to the sales price restrictions in section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended. The commodity set-aside established for any commodity under section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 897), shall be reduced by a quantity equal to the quantity of such commodity financed hereunder which is exported from private stocks."

The amendment was agreed to.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed for a third reading, read the third time, and passed.

Mr. SCHOEPPPEL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD, immediately following the passage of S. 752, the report on the bill.

There being no objection, the report (No. 40) was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

The Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, to whom was referred the bill (S. 752) to amend section 102 (a) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, so as to eliminate the requirement that privately owned stocks exported thereunder be replaced from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks, having considered the same, report thereon with a recommendation that it do pass with an amendment.

This bill which would repeal the buy-back provision of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, Public Law 480, 83d Congress, was favorably considered by a subcommittee. The subcommittee's report is attached hereto and fully explains the bill and the amendment:

"REPORT OF THE SUBCOMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURAL EXPORTS OF THE COMMITTEE ON AGRICULTURE AND FORESTRY ON S. 752

"Your Subcommittee on Agricultural Exports, to whom was referred the bill (S. 752) to amend section 102 (a) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, so as to eliminate the requirement that privately owned stocks exported thereunder be replaced from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks, having considered the same report thereon with the unanimous recommendation that it pass with an amendment.

"The report of the Department of Agriculture recommending enactment of this bill as amended by the subcommittee amendment is set out at the end of this report. Representatives of the American Farm Bureau Federation, the National Grange, and the National Cotton Council as well as representatives of the Department of Agriculture testified in support of the bill at the hearings held by your subcommittee, and it has

also been endorsed by the American Cotton Shippers Association, the American Cotton Manufacturers Institute, and the National Grain Trade Council. No witnesses testified in opposition to the bill.

"This bill would remove the requirement that exporters of privately owned stocks under the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 (Public Law 480, 83d Cong.) acquire an equivalent quantity of Commodity Credit Corporation stocks. At present such acquisition is required by section 102 (a) of that act whenever the Corporation is in a position to supply the commodity.

"The necessity of locating and purchasing replacements from stocks owned or under loan to the Corporation (which in the case of cotton, for most qualities, is currently priced above the market) hampers trade by delaying sales, increasing prices, and adding unnecessary administrative detail. Since generally under the price-support program surplus stocks flow to the Corporation, there does not appear to be any advantage to the Government in requiring replacement from Corporation stocks. Rather such requirement may cause the Government additional expense by increasing the Corporation's volume of loans, acquisitions, and sales. For example an exporter of privately owned cotton under Public Law 480 must now replace that cotton with cotton owned or under loan to the Corporation. Under these circumstances it may be expected that the cotton coming out of CCC owned or loan stocks will be replaced by new cotton going under loan so that the net result of the present requirement is the addition of unnecessary redtape. On February 1 the market price for Middling 1¹/₁₆-inch cotton at Memphis was 34 cents per pound, while the price for CCC-owned cotton was 36.21 cents and CCC-loan cotton of the same quality was somewhere between 34 and 37 cents, depending on the amount the producer gets for his equity. While under the law, CCC could sell its cotton to replace that exported under title I of Public Law 480 at any price it might see fit, it has set such price at the price prescribed by Congress for sales for domestic use in order to encourage use of loan stocks rather than owned stocks and thereby reduce the quantity of loan cotton required to be taken over August 1, 1955. The exporter must take this difference in market price and replacement costs into account in determining the export price of the cotton to be delivered against the sale, and if it results in a higher export price for the cotton, transactions under Public Law 480 will be made that much harder to negotiate.

"The amendment recommended by your subcommittee would add at the end of the bill the following new sentence:

"The commodity set-aside established for any commodity under section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 897) shall be reduced by a quantity equal to the quantity of such commodity financed hereunder which is exported from private stocks."

"This would require the set-aside under section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1954 to be reduced by the quantity of private stocks exported under title I of Public Law 480. This is in keeping with the original purposes of the Agricultural Act of 1954, section 103 (a) (2) of which provides for reduction of set-aside through disposition of Commodity Credit Corporation stocks under title I of Public Law 480. While many witnesses who testified at the hearings on the Agricultural Act of 1954 pointed out how useful the set-aside might be to meet emergency needs, the principal purpose of the set-aside was to insulate the existing surplus from the market so as to permit the new price-support program to function properly. Disposition of the set-aside as rapidly as possible by means designed to avoid interference with the price-support program was always intended and

provided for by the act. As is pointed out in the report of the Department of Agriculture title I sales constitute the only means of appreciably reducing the quantities of wheat and cotton in the set-aside; and it is therefore desirable that all title I sales, whether from public or private stocks, be applied to such reduction.

"The Department's report on the bill is set out below.

"JAMES O. EASTLAND, *Chairman*.

"SPESSARD L. HOLLAND,

"W. KERR SCOTT,

"MILTON R. YOUNG,

"ANDREW F. SCHOEPFEL,

"DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE,

"Washington, D. C., February 17, 1955.

"HON. ALLEN J. ELLENDER,

"Chairman, Committee on Agriculture and Forestry, United States Senate.

"DEAR SENATOR ELLENDER: This is in reply to your request of January 27, 1955, for a report on S. 752, a bill to amend section 102 (a) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, so as to eliminate the requirement that privately owned stocks exported thereunder be replaced from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks.

"Subject to revision in accordance with the recommendation set out below, the Department would favor enactment of S. 752.

"Section 102 (a) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954 currently provides that the Commodity Credit Corporation shall make available for sale, under the act, surplus agricultural commodities acquired by the Corporation in the administration of its price-support operations, and shall make funds available to finance the sale and exportation of such commodities from its owned stocks, from loan stocks, or, if the Corporation is not in a position to supply the commodity out of its owned stocks, from privately owned stocks. That section also provides that to facilitate the use of private trade channels the Corporation, even though it is in a position to supply the commodity, may finance the sale and exportation of privately owned stocks under arrangements whereby the private exporter acquires the same commodity of comparable value or quantity from CCC stocks.

"The bill, S. 752, would amend section 102 (a) to provide that the CCC shall make its stocks of surplus agricultural commodities available for sale under the act and shall make funds available to finance the sale and exportation of surplus agricultural commodities, whether from private stocks or from stocks of the CCC. As amended by S. 752, section 102 (a) would enable United States exporters making sales under the program to ship private stocks without making corresponding purchases from CCC stocks.

"The operation of this amendment would affect cotton primarily at this time. Because the world price and the domestic market price of cotton are approximately the same, exporters can sell private stocks for export at competitive prices. Where this price relationship exists, and especially where these two prices approximate the support price as in the case of cotton, the overall advantages, including the net effect in reducing CCC holdings, will be equally as great whether surpluses are financed for export directly from private stocks or taken or replaced from CCC owned or loan stocks. The amendment would be helpful in eliminating the redtape involved in the replacement procedure and the operation of the program would be facilitated both from the administrative standpoint and from the standpoint of efficient operation of the program through private trade channels.

"It must be noted, however, that title I sales constitute a major means of reducing the commodity set-aside, and are the only means of appreciably reducing the quantities

of wheat and cotton in the set-aside. If S. 752 were enacted in its present form, title I sales from private stocks would not result in reduction of the set-aside. It is, therefore, recommended that the bill be amended by adding at the end thereof the following new sentence:

"The commodity set-aside established for any commodity under section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 897) shall be reduced by a quantity equal to the quantity of such commodity financed hereunder which is exported from private stocks."

"Enactment of S. 752 would require no additional administrative or program funds.

"The Bureau of the Budget advises this Department as follows:

"It is understood that amendment of section 102 (a) of Public Law 480 is necessary to remove from the language of this section an unforeseen impediment to the export of cotton under title I of the act. On this basis, you are advised that there would be no objection to enactment of S. 752 amended as recommended by the Department."

"Sincerely yours,

"TRUE D. MORSE,
"Under Secretary."

CHANGES IN EXISTING LAW

In compliance with subsection (4) of rule XXIX, of the Standing Rules of the Senate, changes in existing law made by the bill, as reported, are shown as follows (existing law proposed to be omitted is enclosed in black brackets, new matter is printed in italic, existing law in which no change is proposed is shown in roman):

"AGRICULTURAL TRADE DEVELOPMENT AND ASSISTANCE ACT OF 1954

"SEC. 102. (a) For the purpose of carrying out agreements concluded by the President hereunder, the Commodity Credit Corporation, in accordance with regulations issued by the President pursuant to subsection (b) of this section, (1) shall make available for sale hereunder [at such points in the United States as the President may direct] to domestic exporters, surplus agricultural commodities heretofore or hereafter acquired by the Corporation in the administration of its price support operations, and (2) shall make funds available to finance the sale and exportation of surplus agricultural commodities [from stocks owned by the Corporation or pledged or mortgaged as security for price support loans or from stocks privately owned if the Corporation is not in a position to supply the commodity from its owned stocks: *Provided*, That to facilitate the use of private trade channels the Corporation, even though it is in a position to supply the commodity, may finance the sale and exportation of privately owned stocks if the Corporation's stocks are reduced through arrangements whereby the private exporter acquires the same commodity of comparable value or quantity from the Commodity Credit Corporation], *whether from private stocks or from stocks of the Commodity Credit Corporation*. In supplying such commodities to [private] exporters under [such arrangements] *this subsection the Commodity Credit Corporation shall not be subject to the sales price [restriction] restrictions in section 407 of the Agricultural Act of 1949, as amended. The commodity set-aside established for any commodity under section 101 of the Agricultural Act of 1954 (68 Stat. 897) shall be reduced by a quantity equal to the quantity of such commodity financed hereunder which is exported from private stocks.*

NOTICE OF AVAILABILITY OF HEARINGS ON HOUSE BILL 4259

Mr. KNOWLAND. Mr. President, I understand the acting majority leader

is about to move that the Senate adjourn until Tuesday next. Before that is done, I should like to call to the attention of Members of the Senate the fact that the hearings before the Senate Committee on Finance on House bill 4259, to provide a 1-year extension of the existing corporate normal tax and of certain existing excise-tax rates, and to provide a \$20 credit against the individual income tax for each personal exemption, have been printed and are now available to all Senators. I have requested that the secretary for the minority make available to each Member on this side of the aisle a copy of the hearings. I hope that majority Members on the other side of the aisle will also have the hearings made available to them and that each will receive a copy, in order that the hearings may be studied over the week-end. Sometimes a point is raised that there has not been a sufficient time to

read the hearings. The hearings are now available, and I hope that fact will expedite consideration of the tax bill next week.

ADJOURNMENT TO TUESDAY

Mr. EASTLAND. Mr. President, I move that the Senate adjourn until 12 o'clock noon on Tuesday next.

The motion was agreed to; and (at 2 o'clock and 1 minute p. m.) the Senate adjourned until Tuesday, March 8, 1955, at 12 o'clock meridian.

NOMINATIONS

Executive nominations received by the Senate March 4, 1955:

UNITED NATIONS

William A. Kimbel, of South Carolina, to be the representative of the United States of America to the 10th session of the Eco-

nomic Commission for Europe of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations.

Kingsley Davis, of New York, to be the representative of the United States of America on the Population Commission of the Economic and Social Council of the United Nations for a term of 3 years expiring December 31, 1957.

FEDERAL MARITIME BOARD

Clarence G. Morse, of California, to be a member of the Federal Maritime Board for the remainder of the term expiring June 30, 1956, vice Louis S. Rothschild.

SUBVERSIVE ACTIVITIES CONTROL BOARD

John Stephens Wood, of Georgia, to be a member of the Subversive Activities Control Board for the term of 3 years expiring March 4, 1958, vice Watson B. Miller, term expired.

UNITED STATES CIRCUIT JUDGE

Warren L. Jones, of Florida, to be United States circuit judge, fifth circuit, vice Louie W. Strum, deceased.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

The Fourth Object of Rotary

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ESTES KEFAUVER

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES
Friday, March 4, 1955

Mr. KEFAUVER. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address which I delivered on Tuesday of this week at the Memphis Rotary Club. As Senators know, I have been concerned by the manner in which our policy has been proceeding in the Far East. I am glad that the President clarified it publicly to some extent this week when, at his press conference, he assured all that this Nation will not help Chiang invade the mainland. I am glad also that the Secretary of State this week did not give Chiang assurances of help in support of the offshore islands. How I feel about this situation is expressed in my address to the Rotary Club.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

It is a great honor that you have invited me to participate in your golden anniversary of Rotary. I have been rereading the object of Rotary. I want to talk with you briefly today about the fourth object. As all of you know, it is: "The advancement of international understanding, goodwill, and peace through a world fellowship of business and professional men united in the ideal of service."

There is no greater need in the world today than just such organizations truly dedicated to just such an object. I am told that there are now 8,431 Rotary clubs, composed of 396,000 Rotarians in 89 different countries. Your Rotary foundation is contributing much toward international understanding by sending students all over the world for a year's study.

The activities of such an international group as yours, really working at the job of effectively carrying out the fourth object can contribute magnificently toward international understanding.

I feel that we Americans today face three major problems. Broadly stated they are these:

1. To preserve the peace.
2. To preserve our constitutional liberties and our free way of life, and
3. To preserve our economic health and prosperity.

All three of these blend together and are really aspects of the same problem—the problem of preserving a free society.

It is the first of these—the problems involved in preserving the peace—which I wish to discuss with you today and which fit in so well with your fourth object.

Anyone would be less than frank to say that we are not today in a very delicate situation in our international relations. Our world is balanced precariously between peace and war.

We want peace—but what has caused me so much concern is the fear that we are forever on the verge of stumbling into war, with the very best of intentions to be sure but with disastrous consequences nevertheless.

I think it is time that we raise our sights. We owe it to ourselves and to posterity to do so. We have been losing the forests in the trees. We haven't been able to see India for Matsu—we haven't been able to see Japan for Quemoy.

If a major war is to be avoided we cannot blink at the fact that the position of the United States in Asia generally is deteriorating steadily and that the Communists are gaining strength through improved tactics. If this trend continues the bulk of free Asia may follow China behind the Iron Curtain within the matter of a decade or so. Long before then, moreover, we may have lost whatever ability we now have to influence events.

An Asian policy broad enough, bold enough, and flexible enough to reverse this dangerous drift must have the support not only of a preponderant majority of the people here at home, but also of our free allies in Europe. Like it or not, there is a situation in the world in which the only alternative to co-existence may be no existence, which could be the result of an atomic or hydrogen war. And coexistence is a two-way street—there has to be give and take on both sides.

I don't think we have been proceeding in a very sophisticated way. For instance, we have just entered into a mutual defense treaty with Chiang Kai-shek. I was one of a minority who voted against it. In this

treaty we mutually agree that if anyone attacks Formosa we will help Chiang and if anyone attacks the United States he in turn will help us.

What's mutual about that? I have no objection to defending Formosa. I think that the United States has both a moral and a legal obligation to do so. Formosa and the Pescadores were liberated from Japan largely by our arms during World War II. Pending their final disposition we are in what amounts to a sort of trustee position. Chiang is there by our forbearance.

We are, therefore, under obligations to defend Formosa, but let's not kid the world or ourselves by keeping up the fiction that Chiang is a great, dynamic force in Asia, and that he will be rushing over to defend the United States should anyone attack us in mutual exchange for our defense of Formosa.

I thought my colleague, from Tennessee, ALBERT GORE, put it very well when he said:

Of course, I have no sympathy whatsoever with the Red Chinese claim to Formosa, but I believe that until final disposition of the islands is determined, neither Chiang nor the Reds have sovereign rights to them. In this respect the Formosa treaty falls short of meeting the definition of a treaty, because treaties are agreements between sovereign nations. Chiang's government is not a sovereign nation, but a government in exile.

Furthermore, Formosa, doesn't include Matsu and Quemoy. These offshore islands are within 5 miles of the China coast. To say that their defense is necessary to the defense of Formosa is about like saying that the defense of Staten Island, in front of the harbor of New York, is necessary to the defense of Bermuda. They may be important to the morale of Chiang Kai-shek but one cannot really expect the Chinese Communists to lie down and play dead with his forces that close to their harbors.

I doubt if the administration intends to defend these islands. We are told that they must keep this unclear in order to confuse the Chinese Communists. The trouble is that it confuses us here at home, too, and it certainly confuses our allies. Thus during this past week we have seen Mr. Eden at the SEATO conference trying to clarify the situation as far as these islands are concerned and Mr. Dulles keeping it unclear.

I had hoped that the administration had given up its go-it-alone policy. However, when we had the Formosa resolution before Congress, it was obvious that it took the

British, our strongest ally, by surprise. Evidently there had been no consultation.

Unless the administration has a very firm rein on Chiang this is very dangerous business. His goal is to return to the mainland. I would rather see him there than Mao, but to be realistic I must say that he can't get there unless we put him there and that brings into play the Sino-Soviet defense treaty, which really is mutual. And I'm not willing to pay that price, particularly when I believe that if the Chinese people ever successfully throw over the Communist regime they will not be looking to Chiang for leadership, but will be looking to some new force.

One disturbing thing is that immediately after ratification of the Formosa treaty, Chiang announced that this meant the United States would defend Quemoy and Matsu even before Dulles indicated we would. At the very least, I prefer to have our policy announced by our own State Department, rather than by the Generalissimo.

A Far Eastern policy tied to Chiang is almost certainly doomed to fail, and by the time the failure is recognized it may be too late to disengage ourselves without grave loss of prestige.

The key to the security of Asia lies instead in the development of dynamic centers of indigenous stability and power which will lend their own growing strength to that of their neighbors—with the military and economic power of America and the Western Alliance discreetly in the background.

The two major potential sources of such stability are Japan and India. The history of our generation in Asia may be written around what happens in these two nations, with one-fifth of the world's population.

If they remain free, there is every reason to believe that the bulk of Asia will remain free. If they go under, the Communists are likely to take over from Tokyo to Cairo. We must continue to defend and support the smaller nations now favorable to us, but we should not assume that they constitute a decisive, effective anti-Communist force.

We must remember also that the real bulwark of our strength in the world is the Western Alliance. For the past 2 years while the administration has fought the so-called war party within the Republican Party the Western Alliance has taken a back seat. The doctrine of massive retaliation enunciated for domestic political purposes along with the unleashing of Chiang Kai-shek frightened our allies. They would stand exposed to massive annihilation.

Now the administration is again showing awareness of the Atlantic concept, but here, too, we have got to drop outworn theories and plan big things. My own strong conviction is that NATO must be more than just a military alliance. It must have political and economic ties as well in order to operate effectively. We will be effective neither in Europe nor in Asia as long as the free world itself is divided on its approach, for the Communist world is not.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PROBLEMS OF AMERICAN FOREIGN POLICY
(Address by Senator ALEXANDER WILEY at Stephen's College, Columbia, Mo., February 22, 1955)

I am grateful to you for asking me to speak on the problems of American foreign policy instead of on the answers. It is a great deal easier to recognize the problems than it is to find the solutions to them, and I will frankly confess at the outset that I do not know the answers to many of the problems I am going to discuss with you.

Still, it is helpful if one knows the problem to which one is looking for an answer. Indeed, a precise definition of the problem may point to an answer. And in this field defining the problem is not so easy an exercise as some people apparently think. There is a great temptation to oversimplify, and oversimplified problems lead to oversimplified solutions.

Let us begin, however, by attempting to define our objective. What is it that we are really trying to achieve through our foreign policy?

The answer to this question, I think, is fairly simple. We want a world in which the American people can live securely, peacefully, prosperously, and happily. That is what is at the bottom of our foreign policy—so far to the bottom that sometimes we lose sight of it and talk about the means by which we try to achieve it as if they were ends in themselves.

Some of us may have strong cultural and sentimental ties with Western Europe, but the preservation of democracy in Western Europe is properly an objective of American foreign policy, not for these reasons, but because the communization of Western Europe would immeasurably reduce the chances for the American people to live as they want to live.

Some of us may have strong emotional feelings about the righteousness of the cause of Chiang Kai-shek and the iniquity of Chou En-lai, but the defense of Formosa is properly an objective of American foreign policy, not for this reason, but because the occupation of Formosa by an unfriendly power would make the defense of the United States more difficult.

Some of us may feel called upon in a spirit of Christian charity to feed the hungry and clothe the naked of Asia, but the success of the Indian 5-year plan is properly an objective of American foreign policy, not for this reason primarily, however appealing it may be, but because a prosperous India can contribute to the peace and well-being of the American people while an impoverished India represents a positive threat to that peace and well-being.

Keeping our eye on the end and not on the means will help us to limit our activities and commitments somewhat, but even so our objective is a pretty big one and our national resources are limited.

Despite our great wealth and power, we are not strong enough to arrange the world precisely as we would like it. Neither are we strong enough or secure enough to ignore the rest of the world.

This seeming paradox sets the upper and lower limits of our foreign policy. Regardless of our likes or dislikes, there are many things which we cannot do, and at the other end of the scale there are some things which we must do.

Although we still occasionally hear voices urging upon us the doctrine of isolationism, I think the suicidal implications of that doctrine have by this time been pretty well established.

It is rather a curious thing, however, that some of the people who have been emotionally inclined toward isolationism have now swung to the other extreme. Whereas

formerly they wanted to have nothing at all to do with the rest of the world, they are now clamoring for all kinds of impossible intercessions. I am sure you are familiar with the type. They have what we might call ultimatum mentality. They demand that we tell the Soviet Union and Communist China to behave themselves or else. What is even worse, they demand that we have the effrontery to tell one of our sovereign allies to do as we say "or else." Apparently they are not at all concerned that the "else" in one case might be hydrogen warfare and in the other case the loss of a valued ally.

One extreme is as bad as the other. The ostrich, which hides its head in the sand, is not particularly more stupid than the rhinoceros, which charges at every noise it hears.

Both of these extremes fail to take adequately into account four major international facts of this mid-20th-century world. These facts are:

1. The existence of aggressive communism with sufficient resources and power to constitute serious threat to all free societies.
2. The development of technology at an ever-increasing tempo.
3. The dynamic urge for political independence and economic development which characterizes most of the non-Communist world.
4. A shrunken world due to man's ingenuity.

Any one of these facts, taken alone, would present a challenge to American foreign policy. But they are interrelated, and the problems presented by each become more acute and more difficult because of the existence of the others.

NATURE OF COMMUNIST THREAT

Let us consider some of the implications of these facts, and let us begin with the nature of the threat posed by aggressive communism.

This threat is only in part military. It is also in part economic and political. It has been most immediate, however, in its military aspects, and this is the form in which it is easiest to meet.

Compared to our other problems, it is a relatively simple matter to draw a line around the Western Hemisphere or around Western Europe and to generate, in concert with our allies, enough military strength to create doubts in the minds of the potential aggressor as to his ability successfully to breach that line.

In his first annual message to Congress in 1790, George Washington, whose birthday we celebrate today, said: "To be prepared for war is one of the most effectual means of preserving peace."

Well-meaning people have sometimes criticized our policy as being too heavily militaristic; but when you are confronted with overwhelming military power, you necessarily have to devote first attention to building some sort of a defense structure. While doing this we have by no means neglected the political and economic aspects of the Soviet threat, but I think the time has now come when we must give these aspects even greater attention.

IMPLICATIONS OF HYDROGEN WEAPONS

One reason for this is found in the second major international fact which I mentioned earlier—the ever-increasing tempo of technological development. This is one of the factors which seems to me to make all-out war a remote possibility, if, indeed, it is any longer possible at all. In the cobalt-coated hydrogen bomb, technology has given us something which, if it is not the absolute weapon, is at least so close to it as to raise grave questions as to whether its use would be self-defeating. Both the United States and the Soviet Union may very well at this moment have the mutual power of total

Problems of American Foreign Policy

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 4, 1955

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address which I was pleased to deliver on Washington's Birthday at Stephen's College in Columbia, Mo.

destruction. This includes, of course, self-destruction.

In dealing with nuclear weapons, you very quickly reach a point beyond which superiority becomes meaningless. If each side has the power to inflict a mortal blow upon the other, then it doesn't matter if one side has twice as much power as the other.

I once heard this point made in terms of less awesome weapons. For example: If I am pointing a .38-caliber pistol at you, and you are pointing a B-B gun at me, I have a very great superiority. But if we each increase our strength, so that I am pointing a .45-caliber pistol at you and you are pointing a .38-caliber pistol at me, then, although I would still have a superiority of sorts, it wouldn't really do me very much good in and of itself.

GROWTH OF TECHNOLOGY

As the military applications of technology make all-out war more nearly impossible, and as the defensive strength of the free world increases in other respects, aggressive communism tends to shift its tactics from overt military action to other means. These other means cannot be met by military measures. They require a good deal of imaginative, constructive thinking on our part.

The United States has risen—one might almost say it has been thrust—to its present extraordinary position of wealth and prestige with only 6 percent of the world's land area and only 7 percent of the world's population. Other countries have more natural resources. Other countries have more people. But none has approached the United States in either total or per capita production.

There is an old saying that "It's what you do with what you have that counts." Americans have done the most with what they had. The atmosphere of political and economic freedom which has always prevailed in the United States has had a great deal to do with it, but there is more to it than that.

One of the great advantages which the United States has in world competition—perhaps at this moment in history the greatest single advantage—is our superior technology. This superiority is so marked that we are apt to take it for granted. But it is not inherent. There is nothing peculiarly American about genius. Indeed, there is evidence to suggest that genius occurs with no more frequency per million Americans than per million non-Americans. The difference lies in the fact that the American system of education and of social organization makes possible a greater development of the talents which are inherent in all people.

Recent studies, however, indicate that the Soviet Union is bending every effort to close the technological gap between itself and the United States. More scientists, engineers, and technicians are being trained in the Soviet Union than in the United States. And the evidence is that they are being well trained. This to me is an alarming fact, and one that we had better do something about.

It seems to me, for example, extremely wasteful of talented manpower to draft bright young scientists into the Armed Forces. These people can make a greater contribution to the security of the United States by working in laboratories than by carrying a gun.

We would also be well-advised to take steps to train more high school and college teachers in mathematics and the physical sciences. Our position in the world dictates such a course, quite apart from considerations of domestic policy and aid to education generally.

I would not want it inferred from this, however, that our schools should emphasize science and technology to the exclusion, or even to the neglect, of the humanities and other fields of learning. As short as we are of technicians, it could still be argued that

our technological progress has outstripped our social progress. One need only look at the impressive fact that although scientists have discovered how to blow us up, statesmen haven't discovered how to keep them from it.

It is important, therefore, that we maintain, or if possible widen, the technological and economic gap between ourselves and the Soviet Union. At the same time, it is equally important that we narrow that gap between ourselves and the underdeveloped countries of the free world.

The economic disparity between the United States and these countries is great—and it is growing at an increasing rate. This trend is not in our national interest.

I have frequently said that the world today is one big neighborhood. Now, no matter how well off you may be yourselves, you cannot have a really good neighborhood if most of the families in it are on the verge of starvation. And the United States cannot continue rich and growing richer in this world neighborhood today so long as a majority of the human race, in the words of Fairfield Osborn, is "living in a crisis whose monotone is interrupted only by catastrophe."

People in this condition make poor customers. They also make poor suppliers—and more and more of the materials our industry uses come from abroad.

Thus, it is our national interest to encourage the economic development of underdeveloped countries on economic grounds alone. Given the existence of the Soviet threat, it is also in our national interest on political and military grounds. From the military point of view, highly developed countries are better able to defend themselves, and to join in measures of collective defense against overt aggression. From the political point of view, they are better able to defend themselves against subversion.

The matter takes on particular urgency at this moment in history because of the third of the major international facts which I mentioned at the beginning; the drive for political independence and economic development in these underdeveloped countries. These twin urges pose different problems for American foreign policy.

DRIVE FOR POLITICAL INDEPENDENCE

The United States itself was born in a revolution against colonialism, and it has traditionally been anticolonial. Most Americans can easily understand the desire of other people to govern themselves.

Our history confirms that we sympathize with that desire. We set a target date for the independence of the Philippines and stuck by it. We allowed the people of Puerto Rico to work out their own destiny, and they freely chose to become a self-governing commonwealth in association with the United States. We have turned down many opportunities to acquire overseas colonies and possessions.

We have used our good offices, through the United Nations and in direct contacts, to hasten the withdrawal of colonial powers from other territories, many of which are now sovereign states. At the same time, however, we have found some of our principal allies in the world struggle against aggressive communism among the colonial powers of Europe. Because of our close relations with these powers, we have been tarred throughout much of Africa and Asia with a kind of colonial guilt by association.

For understandable, but also, I fear, ill-founded, reasons, we have too frequently sought to steer a middle course, torn between military logic which dictated that we support our European allies on the one hand, and on the other hand our historic sympathies which dictated that we support the colonial peoples. After much travail of spirit, we have usually aligned ourselves in the end with the colonial peoples.

Speaking now with the benefit of hindsight over the last 10 years, I think we should have been much less equivocal about our position in these matters. I do not say that in any spirit of criticism of those who have been in charge of our policies, because I am not prepared to say that I would have done it differently myself—given the circumstances which existed at the time. I am not one of those who believes in using hindsight to take an unfair advantage of someone in public office. Hindsight is useful only to the extent that it helps us to avoid mistakes in the future. But if we had it to do over, I would advocate a much stronger policy in favor of freedom and independence for the colonial areas of the world. It is not yet too late to adopt such a policy, and I believe we are moving in that direction. Actually, of course, more people have achieved political independence in the last decade than at any other comparable period of history.

DRIVE FOR ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT

The record of economic development does not, unfortunately, show as much progress. A start—and on the whole, an encouraging start—has been made, but the difficulties are so complex that we do not as yet thoroughly understand the problem. Here, especially, we must guard against the tendency toward oversimplification against which I warned at the outset. There is a proneness in some quarters, and not least in some of the underdeveloped countries themselves, to think that massive doses of capital investment, administered by the United States, will bring about the desired results. The problem is not that simple, nor is the cure that expensive.

This is another field in which what the United States can do is limited, not only by our own resources but also by the attitudes of the people with whom we are dealing. After all, it is their countries we are talking about, and they can do as they please with them. We should—and we do—stand ready to help insofar as we properly can, but the initiative and most of the effort must come from the people who are being helped.

Economic development is an exceedingly intricate process, consisting of many things, but one of its most important aspects is psychological. Economic development—or economic stagnation to look at the other side of the coin—is in part a state of mind. It is the result of a combination of circumstances which can rarely, if ever, be induced from without. The urge for economic development must be self-generated.

At this point, it is important to distinguish between the urge for economic development and the simple desire for automobiles, air conditioners, and steel plants. Economic development is closely related to cultural attitudes and social organization. Before a country can economically have automobile factories, it must have enough people with enough money to buy the automobiles, and it must have highways for the automobiles to run on. It must have an agricultural production efficient enough to feed the persons who will have to give up farming themselves in order to work in the automobile factories. If it wants greater agricultural production, is it willing to change its system of land tenure which, in at least some underdeveloped countries, breeds inefficiency? If it wants greater industrial production, is it willing to step on the toes of the privileged few who have a vested interest in monopoly and restrictions on output—a privileged few who are usually in positions of great political power? Finally, if it wants eventually to have a complex corporate economy, is it willing to revise its social ideas about the position of women, without whom the American economy could not operate a single day?

These are all questions which can be answered only by the country itself. What its

answers are will indicate whether it really has the urge to develop or whether it merely wants the material results of economic development without the social and cultural reorganization which such development implies.

Economic development is only in part the result of capital investment. It is also an aggregate of technical skills—the knowledge and capacity to make efficient use of capital and capital goods. This is the field in which, in my judgment the United States can make the most worthwhile contribution to the economic development of underdeveloped countries.

In this context, then, it seems to me that the proper course for the United States to follow is to adopt, on a long-term basis, a policy of furnishing technical assistance to countries which are genuinely interested in making efficient use of it. You can get more results in work of this kind from a billion dollars spent over 10 years than from a billion dollars spent in 1 year. Indeed, if we tried to spend that much in 1 year in the areas I am talking about, it would be largely wasted. Among other things, it would cause a severe inflation and leave the country which was supposedly being helped worse off than before.

I would not rule out entirely funds for capital investment. But such activities should be limited to specific situations in which a clear and compelling case can be made.

The problem is further complicated by the fact that results are required quickly. Throughout Asia, Communist propaganda is telling people that communism offers a short-cut to economic development. The short-cut, of course, is slave labor but sometimes a people may not realize the implications of this until it is too late.

PEACEFUL USES OF ATOMIC ENERGY

We may now, thanks again to technology, have found a way to speed up the process within the framework of a free society. As atomic energy provided the weapons which may have made war impossible, so atomic energy may also have provided the materials which will make peace durable. Potentially the most hopeful development of the atomic age is the movement through the United Nations to establish an international pool of atomic energy materials for peaceful uses. Growing out of the President's great speech before the U. N. General Assembly in December 1953, this movement has made slow but nonetheless real progress and there are grounds for encouragement that more progress may be made in the next several months.

This promises, indeed, to be one of the great imaginative triumphs of American diplomacy. The Soviet reaction indicates that the Kremlin is fully aware of the danger which is posed to its own schemes. The first reaction of the Soviet delegate to the U. N. was automatic—he criticized the President's speech. Within 48 hours, his bosses in Moscow had taken a new reading on world opinion and instructed him to make noises of cooperation. In the intervening period, the Soviet Union has tried to block the project without giving the appearance of doing so—and without being wholly successful on either count. All in all, the last 14 months must have been a very trying time for the Communists. They have used it, however, to push feverishly ahead on their own research into the peaceful applications of atomic energy.

It is just as important that we stay ahead of the Soviets in regard to the peaceful use of atomic energy as it is that we stay ahead of them in regard to the military applications. It is perhaps not too much to say that the uncommitted world of Asia will go to the side that first develops a feasible means of using atomic energy for peaceful purposes on a large scale. For that reason,

we can welcome the recent decision to supply heavy water to India.

It may very well be that the benefits of atomic energy can be made available in underdeveloped countries before they become practicable in countries such as the United States. In a country with a shortage of electric power and with fuel resources which are either insignificant or underdeveloped, for example, it would be economical to generate electricity from atomic energy at higher costs than in a country with abundant and well-developed supplies of other fuels.

We can only guess at what large quantities of atomic-generated electric power would mean in the underdeveloped countries of the world. Irrigation projects would become feasible to bring vast new areas of land into cultivation with all that that would mean in terms of an increased food supply, a better diet for the people, and improved distribution of land ownership. Multitudinous new light industries could be established.

There are undoubtedly other uses which we cannot now foresee. The potentialities are so vast that any sort of analogy with known experience is dangerous. But one comparison which suggests itself and which may be indicative, if not precise, is that the atomic powerplant may very well do for Asia what the steam engine did for Europe—and that, of course, is to remake totally the economy and society of the area.

We must not allow ourselves to become so preoccupied with day-to-day crises that we lose sight of these underlying, long-range problems that I have been talking about. But at the same time, of course, we have to deal effectively with today—or else tomorrow may never come. So let us now examine briefly 2 or 3 of our more pressing immediate crises. There are, unfortunately, a large number from which we can choose, but let us take two on opposite sides of the world—one in the Far East and one in Europe.

SITUATION IN FAR EAST

Paradoxically, it seems to me that both the chances of war and the chances of peace have increased in the Far East in the last month. This results primarily from the fact that both military and diplomatic activity in the area of Formosa have been stepped up, and the situation, which had been in something of a stalemate, has become more fluid. It is now off dead center, but we do not yet know which way it will move. This is another instance in which the power and influence of the United States are limited, and we must frankly admit that the decision is to a large degree up to the Communists. If they want war, there will be war. If they want to avoid war, they can do so very easily.

So far as the United States is concerned, our basic position is quite simple. Our national interests do not permit us to tolerate the occupation of Formosa by an unfriendly power. The island is an integral part of the chain which runs north and south in the Western Pacific from the Aleutians through Japan, the Ryukyus, Formosa, the Philippines, Australia, and New Zealand. World War II provided a vivid demonstration of what even some of these islands in unfriendly hands can mean to the United States. Formosa provides a potential enemy a means to outflank the Philippines, as well as our bases on Okinawa in the Ryukyus. The Philippines and Ryukyus, in turn, provide stepping stones to other islands and so on, until we reach Hawaii and the west coast.

Since the end of World War II, Formosa has been in friendly hands—namely, the Republic of China headed by Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek. But its status in international law is not entirely clear. Prior to the 1890's, Formosa was occupied by the Chinese, and it was ceded by China to Japan some 60 years ago. In the Cairo Declara-

tion of World War II, President Roosevelt, Prime Minister Churchill, and Generalissimo Chiang agreed that it should be returned to China. In the Japanese Peace Treaty, Japan renounced all claims to the island, but no affirmative disposition of it was made. It should be noted that the Soviet Union was a party neither to the Cairo Declaration nor to the Japanese Peace Treaty.

Since 1950 there have in effect been two Chinas—one on the mainland, which is Communist, and one on Formosa and a few other islands, which is not Communist. The United States, the United Nations, and most of the nations of the world have recognized the non-Communist regime on Formosa as the legitimate Republic of China.

As long as these two Chinas spar with each other across the Straits of Formosa there exists an area of international tension which is in constant danger of erupting into full-scale war. The situation has become increasingly acute since last September as the Communists have stepped up their attacks on the Nationalist-held islands and as they have filled the air with loud declarations of their firm resolve to capture Formosa.

Two other new elements have also been added. First, the United States has made it as clear as possible—we hope beyond the possibility of misinterpretation even in Peiping—that we will use American Armed Forces to protect Formosa and the Pescadores. We have already used our Armed Forces to protect the withdrawal of Chinese Nationalists from the Tachen Islands in a redeployment which will not only strengthen the overall Nationalist position but will also remove a potential trouble spot.

Second, the United Nations Security Council has taken cognizance of the situation, and efforts are under way to arrive at a cease-fire which will introduce at least some measure of stability into the situation. I do not know what the outcome of those efforts will be. So far as the U. N. itself is concerned, the prospects do not at this moment look particularly favorable. But at least the question has been opened up, and it is a matter of active concern to the world's statesmen, not only in Washington but also in London and New Delhi, and we may hope in Moscow and Peiping.

The United States should support these efforts to achieve a cease-fire, insisting only that our vital interests be protected. We can protect those interests without becoming involved in a war on the mainland of China. The prevention of such a war should be one of the primary objectives of our policy.

SITUATION IN EUROPE

Let us look now at Europe, where the stakes are, in some ways, even higher than they are in the Far East.

Western Europe contains the world's greatest aggregation of industrial capacity and technical skills outside the United States. With Western Europe a part of the free world, our preponderance of economic strength over the Soviet bloc is overwhelming. With Western Europe behind the Iron Curtain, our economic strength and that of the Soviet bloc would more nearly approach parity.

Through the Marshall plan, we strengthened Europe economically so that it could resist subversion and at the same time support a military effort of its own. Through the North Atlantic Treaty Organization, the military defenses of Europe have been further built up.

But one more tremendously important step remains to be taken, and that is to make the skills, the energies, and the resources of the people of Western Germany available for the common defense of Western Europe. We thought a way had been found to do that through the European Defense Community, but national jealousies were still too great, and the memories of three German occupations of France were still too vivid.

Now, through wise statesmanship, an alternative has been worked out to admit the Federal Republic of Germany to NATO, to restore German sovereignty, and to provide for the rearmament of Germany.

The London and Paris agreements which make provision for these steps have been approved by the French National Assembly, but we still wait for action by the French Council. We wait, also, for action by the German Bundestag.

Meanwhile, we see a political deterioration in both France and Germany. In France, one government crisis follows another. In Germany, delay brings with it increasing opposition to the agreements.

Actually, what is involved is more than simply adding German strength to our system of collective security in Western Europe. What is really involved is the integration of Europe—a dream of a thousand years that is now so close and yet apparently still so far from realization.

If we fail this time, we may not again soon have another chance. Yet here we have another instance of a situation beyond the control of the United States. We can only watch and wait and pray—and remind our friends in Europe that this is a time for responsibility, for rising—as Lincoln said—with the occasion, and for putting aside petty jealousies in the interests of the whole community.

UNITED NATIONS

No discussion of the problems of American foreign policy would be complete without considerable emphasis on the United Nations. It is perhaps not a very great exaggeration to say that no organization has ever accomplished so much in the face of so many difficulties. By any standard, the list of what the U. N. has done is impressive. It becomes positively astonishing when one remembers that the U. N. was founded on the principle of Big Five unanimity in the Security Council and that that unanimity hardly survived the San Francisco Conference.

To mention only a few of the U. N.'s accomplishments, it got Russian troops out of Azerbaijan, it ended the Israeli-Arab fighting, it preserved the integrity of South Korea, and through its technical assistance program it has made a modest but hopeful beginning toward improving standards of life in underdeveloped countries.

But it has done more than this. It has provided an international forum where nations can talk out their problems and differences, where the whole world can see the obstructionist tactics of the Soviet Union and the constructive efforts of the free nations. It has provided an excellent means of clarifying the issues in the cold war.

That the United Nations has accomplished as much as it has despite the abuse of the Soviet veto is a clear indication of the powerful, underlying desire of the nations and the people of the earth for an international organization to keep the peace.

The United Nations deserves our full support. I do not have very much patience with people who criticize the U. N. because it falls somewhere short of perfection. No human institution will ever be perfect; nor will one ever be improved by carping complaints.

CONCLUSION

Now, in conclusion, let us try to sum up by formulating some principles which can serve as guideposts for the United States to follow in making and carrying out its foreign policy.

First, we must measure up to the position of leadership which we occupy in the world, but we must at the same time remember our own limitations.

Second, the foremost of these limitations is that we cannot live alone. We must have allies. The only real security lies in collective security.

Third, although the Soviet veto in the U. N. has made it necessary for us to develop a series of regional security alliances, we must remember that the best instrumentality for developing a real system of collective security is the United Nations.

Fourth, although we must not neglect the military aspects of our security, we must pay increasing attention to the political and economic aspects.

Fifth, we must continue technical and other assistance to promote the economic development of underdeveloped countries.

Sixth, we must continue and strengthen our overseas information programs, not merely to counteract Soviet lies about us, but more importantly to present an affirmative story of freedom.

Seventh, and possibly most important of all, we must keep faith with ourselves and our allies. Let the Communists entangle themselves in devious Machiavellian plots. In foreign relations, as in personal relations, honesty and frankness are the best policies.

With our minds so much on the Far East, I cannot help but recall the teaching of Confucius (and this the Chinese Communists would do well to recall) that there are three essentials to a state—a revenue, an army, and good faith. Of these three, he said, "the greatest is good faith. Without a revenue and without an army, a state may still exist, but it cannot exist without good faith."

Education: Democracy's Indispensable Weapon

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. LISTER HILL

OF ALABAMA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 4, 1955

Mr. HILL. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD an address which I delivered before the convention of the American Association of School Administrators, at St. Louis, Mo., on Monday, February 28, 1955.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

EDUCATION: DEMOCRACY'S INDISPENSABLE WEAPON

(Address of Hon. LISTER HILL, United States Senator from Alabama, before the convention of the American Association of School Administrators, St. Louis, Mo., February 28, 1955)

The public school, conceived in a frontier settlement more than three centuries ago, is one of the great rocks on which our Nation has been built. In the early days of this Republic, learning, reason, and faith in the people's capacity to govern themselves inspired that adventurous spirit which dared trust the future of an infant nation to the judgment of the many instead of the dictates of the few. The lives and fortunes of individual Americans, the nature of our institutions, the quality of our industry, commerce, and agriculture, the conservation and use of our natural resources, the nature of our law—the destiny of the Nation itself—depend on decisions rendered by all the people. The public school was created to inform the popular wisdom.

The magnitude of the responsibility resting on public education was forcefully described by Jefferson when he declared: "If a nation expects to be ignorant and free in a state of civilization, it expects what never was and never will be."

The frontiers of our forefathers have faded from the American scene. Today we live

among busy lanes of commerce, mighty industries, complex networks of communications, productive farms, great hydroelectric plants, and, now, the harnessing of nuclear power.

These are achievements of generations of American men and women educated in our system of free public schools—achievements wrought by a nation grounded in belief in the supreme worth of the individual man, his dignity, his freedom, his capacity to meet the challenge of each new age.

These are the values and traditions that have led people all over the earth to turn longing eyes toward America, to knock on her door for admittance. These are the values and traditions that have made people in the free nations turn to America for leadership in this time of crisis. These are the values and traditions upon which the greatness of America rests. These are the values and traditions that our schools must preserve and perpetuate.

Our schools, as has been so eloquently stated by your splendid president, Mr. Larson, "are the backbone of our national defense, the bulwark of our free enterprise system, and the foundation of a trained and loyal American citizenship."

Yet, anyone who studies our public schools today, as it has been my opportunity and responsibility to do as a citizen and a Member of your Congress, knows that American education is in serious trouble.

The millions of children attending school on a part-time basis, in makeshift quarters, in overcrowded classrooms, evidence the plight of education in America today. Census figures on the increased millions of children already born who will be crowding through our schoolhouse doors in the years immediately ahead pose an even more desperate situation.

Quantitatively and qualitatively we are possessed of an education deficit that threatens the very capacity of the American people—scientifically, politically, and intellectually—to cope with the most complex and most dangerous problems in the history of freedom.

Educationally speaking, we are still breathing the quiet air of the peaceful years before the wars and revolutions of the first half of the 20th century wrought a world filled with malice and fear.

As we analyze what has taken place in the world, we know that the fall of the Western democracies from their preeminence was due not as much to the designs of evil men as that those nations lacked the clarity of purpose and resolution of mind and heart to deal successfully with the world disorders which made possible the rise to power of the totalitarian warlords.

The world disorder has forced us to adopt a radically higher and different defense concept, employing the most terrible and costly weapons that man can devise, yet we have been willing to limp along on an educational system that is wholly inadequate for turning out sufficient numbers of highly trained citizens and for meeting the multiplied demands for moral discipline and wisdom of great affairs.

The hour demands a radically higher and different concept of education.

Our supreme and ultimate aim is to build a world in which all men may live together in peace. But, if we are to build the peace, we must first be able to survive.

We know that our ability to survive in this era of warlords of aggression rests upon our ability to marshal superior brainpower against the brawn of overwhelming numbers. And our edge is slipping away as our educational system falls further and further behind in the quality and quantity of its product while Russia is pushing her educational effort to unprecedented heights.

One field in which this is clearly apparent is that of the training of engineers and scientists.

Our defense authorities tell us that Russian schools this year will graduate some 54,000 engineers, as compared with only 19,000 to be graduated in the entire United States. This is a ratio of 3 to 1. The ratio is as bad or worse with respect to physicists and scientists of every kind. But this is not the worst of the story of how Russia is outstripping us. Russian facilities will turn out approximately a quarter of a million technicians in nonengineering categories this year, while Americans with comparable training will number but 10,000. This is a ratio of 25 to 1.

Dr. M. H. Trytten, of the National Research Council, and Dr. John R. Dunning, atomic expert and dean of Columbia University School of Engineering, have warned that if present trends continue—that is to say, if our education systems fails to effect a sharp increase in the annual output of engineers and other scientific graduates, the Russians will catch up with us in the next 5 years and after that they will pass us in the race.

The same warning has been echoed by Prof. Joel Hildebrand, president of the American Chemical Society. "In producing scientists," Professor Hildebrand declared, "we need to run very much faster if we intend to win the race for survival."

Today we are reaping the harvest of years of neglect of our educational system—of waste of the talent of our youth. Dr. John K. Norton, head of the department of educational administration, Columbia University, told our committee at our hearings on school-construction legislation that "more than half the children who enter at the first grade fail to finish high school." He added that "even more important in terms of its effects upon our preparedness is the fact that only one-half of our top talent, those who get high marks in high school, who pass intelligence tests, who it is generally agreed could do college work and do it well, actually do so." "We are," Dr. Norton declared, "wasting one-half of our top talent in terms of giving them substantial professional, technical, or vocational training."

We must bring to a halt the 50-percent dropout rate in our elementary and secondary schools. We must make certain that more and more of the top talent among our high-school graduates is fully capitalized through college and university training.

We know that if we are to do these things—if we are to build our professional manpower resources—we must begin in our elementary and secondary schools for it is here that our young people must be trained and prepared to pursue college and university training.

Emphasizing the urgent need for training more scientists, the National Science Foundation in its annual report just submitted to the President and the Congress declared that the fostering of scientific training involves first the matter of incentives.

"The primary and indispensable incentive," the National Science Foundation report declared, "is a deep, personal, and indefatigable interest in scientific discovery. To find ways to promote that interest is," the report concluded, "of first importance and leads directly to the quality of the teaching in the secondary schools."

We must sharply increase our supply of well-trained teachers. To do so, we must lift the level of teachers' salaries from its present rank among the lowest of all employed groups in America to its rightful place.

Indeed, the hour demands a bill of rights for the teacher; a bill of rights guaranteeing a salary which will enable the teacher to enjoy a good standard of living, to permit recreation and travel, continued study and educational growth, and provide security in old age.

The bill of rights must go further. It must recognize the essential worth and dig-

nity of the teacher and assure full opportunity to take part in the life of the community—outside the classroom. The teacher must be free of the petty restraints and interferences with his personal life that are so often imposed in many communities. The teacher must be protected from the unprincipled demagogic attacks that fetter the mind, breed suspicion and fear, and threaten the very destruction of free public education.

Teaching has long been called a profession. We must make it a profession, in fact—appreciated and honored in the community, adequately paid and acclaimed for devoted public service.

The total accumulated needs of our educational system are so great that we cannot, with any reasonable hope of success, attack them all at one and the same time on any major scale.

Today the States and local communities and the across-the-board needs of education are straitjacketed by our \$12 billion classroom deficit and the 6-year certainty of continued recordbreaking school enrollments. Our best hope of relieving the deficit and of enabling the States and local communities to turn more of their efforts and resources to raising teacher salaries and to meeting the other needs of education lies in the Federal Government putting its shoulder to the wheel and providing substantial Federal aid for school construction.

As soon as the returns of the elections last November were known and it became evident that I would be chairman of the Senate Committee on Labor and Public Welfare, I pledged to our parents, teachers, and school officials that the very first bill that I would introduce in the new Congress and the very first bill that I would take up in the committee would be for Federal aid for school construction.

On the very first legislative day of the Senate, I, along with 29 of my Senate colleagues, introduced Senate bill 5, providing \$1 billion in Federal aid for school construction over a 2-year period.

On the same day the President referred to the school crisis in his state of the Union message and announced he would have more to say in a special message on February 15. This was encouraging but the idea of waiting another 5 or 6 weeks to see what the President might say would—it seemed to me—involve a breaking of faith with our parents, teachers, and school officials to whom I had pledged full speed ahead. So we moved forthwith with hearings and consideration of Senate bill 5 and similar bills that were ready for action.

As we know, the President early this month sent to Congress his education message and the administration bill. Our committee moved promptly to hold hearings and consider the bill.

The administration bill provoked a storm of protests from educators and school officials. Spokesmen for leading educational organizations, experts on school financing problems, State school laws, and State constitutional provisions came before our committee at the hearings and literally took the administration bill apart.

One witness called it Federal aid for investment bankers. Others said they are prohibited by their State constitutions and State laws from complying with the loan provisions of the bill. Still others said their school districts could not afford to go further into debt or pay interest or amortize Federal loans or pay rent on school buildings without seriously reducing the already inadequate funds for salaries to teachers.

Stating that the bill provides "much too little aid and much too much control," Dr. William Carr, executive secretary of the National Education Association, declared that the NEA refuses to "embrace untested and hastily formulated proposals which do not

conform to the existing pattern of State and local school administration."

Dr. Carr declared further that the bill while hedged about with unnecessary restrictions and controls, provides only token assistance.

He showed that while Secretary Hobby and Commissioner of Education Brownell have spoken of the administration's bill as a proposal to set in motion a \$7 billion school program, analysis of the bill reveals that actually the only Federal expenditure for construction provided is \$67 million a year for 3 years—less than 1 percent a year of the huge \$7 billion figure Secretary Hobby and Commissioner Brownell have been talking about.

Dr. Edgar Fuller, executive secretary of the Council of Chief State School Officers, told the committee that he had "never seen a bill that had more Federal control. Under the bill," Dr. Fuller declared, "there would be General Accounting Office people, tax attorneys, estimators of building values, and a horde of Federal officials in local school districts. The bill," Dr. Fuller declared, "is written with the tone of a mortgage banker who is lending money to a pauper and is going to tie him down just as solidly as he can to make sure he gets back every cent plus a good rate of interest. As this bill is written," Dr. Fuller declared, "the Federal Government will eventually make a profit at the expense of the school districts of the county most in need. The Chief State School Officers," Dr. Fuller declared, "would not favor the bill because it would set up separate State agencies and because it would be too expensive and because it would be an example of Federal discrimination against schools in contrast with generous Federal grants to highways, hospitals, and other physical facilities in the States. It would," he continued, "make education an orphan, deny it broad sources of income that every other service has and throw the schools back on real estate taxes as a permanent policy."

Our committee heard either in person or by telegrams and other communications from 40 out of the 48 State superintendents of education. Not one favored the bill.

Dr. Carr and other educators cited as the proper kind of approach to school construction legislation the bills developed and sponsored by the late Senators Elbert Thomas, of Utah, and Robert Taft, of Ohio, and myself. The bills embodied these fundamental principles:

1. Direct grants to all the States;
2. Allocation of funds on an objective formula;
3. Administration of the funds by the established State and local agencies.

We have twice passed in the Senate by overwhelming vote, bills containing these principles. These are the principles of Senate bill 5.

Every day of delay deepens the crisis in our schools.

The testimony before our committee made clear that with the passage of Senate bill 5 at least 42 States, under authority of State statutes already on the books, can begin at once to put Federal funds to work along with State and local funds to build schoolhouses for our children.

I am urging that Senate bill 5, strengthened and fortified in every possible way be quickly brought to the Senate floor that we may pass it now. With your splendid help, we shall win the battle.

Please let me take this opportunity of telling you how helpful the support of your association has been in the fight for our Oil for Education amendment, which will dedicate to education the income from the oil wealth of the Outer Continental Shelf. With your help we won adoption of the amendment in the Senate in the last Congress. We have reintroduced the amendment and are carrying on the fight for final victory.

From these oil resources \$150 million has already come into the Treasury and the Department of the Interior has predicted that the revenues will ultimately exceed \$6 billion.

The \$150 million that has already been derived and the revenues that will follow should be put to work to help meet the financial crisis in our schools and colleges.

Here is nontax revenue for relieving the financial straits of our elementary and secondary schools, for providing more and better schools and better trained teachers, and for scholarships, fellowships, and training and research grants. With your continued help, my friends, these revenues will become education's endowment for the future.

As we provide for the education of our children, we nourish the wisdom of America at its roots, we strengthen the well-springs of our democracy, we build the strength and security of our country and build for the peace of the world.

Centenary of St. Mary's College, Near South Bend, Ind.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. HOMER E. CAPEHART

OF INDIANA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 4, 1955

Mr. CAPEHART. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement in commemoration of the centenary observance this year of St. Mary's College, near South Bend, Ind.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

CENTENARY OBSERVANCE OF ST. MARY'S COLLEGE, NEAR SOUTH BEND, IND.

St. Mary's College for women, the first Catholic women's college in the United States empowered to grant degrees and the first to confer bachelors' degrees continuously, celebrates the centenary of its establishment at its present site just north of South Bend, Ind., during 1955.

The college began as an academy for girls in Bertrand, Mich., in 1844 and held its first commencement 4 years later. Four young French Sisters of the Holy Cross, members of the order established 2 years previously, came to the Indiana frontier in 1843 to assist the priests and brothers who had founded the University of Notre Dame only a year before.

The Sisters began their work in America by assuming housekeeping duties for the new mission school of Notre Dame, but soon established their own girls school at Bertrand, 6 miles north of Notre Dame, and the school was chartered by the State of Michigan in 1851.

As the decade of the 1850's opened, the Sisters came to realize that Chicago was fast replacing Bertrand as the area's population and trading center.

Early in 1855, the Sisters of the Holy Cross moved their young school to its present location north of South Bend, Ind., and west of the University of Notre Dame. The State of Indiana promptly granted an academic charter to the school (February 28) "for the education of young ladies in the various branches of arts and sciences * * * and to confer such degrees upon scholars as are usual." In April 1855 the cornerstone was laid for the first building.

The convent and novitiate later (1868) became the motherhouse of the United States Sisters of the Holy Cross.

Under Mother M. Angela, first directress of studies, who guided the school until 1870, St. Mary's developed a curriculum acclaimed by both Catholic and non-Catholic educators.

While emphasizing the study of the liberal arts—still the foundation of a St. Mary's education—the college curriculum continued to add specialized courses.

The most memorable event for the young science department at St. Mary's came in 1899 when the first long distance wireless transmission in the United States was received at the college.

Prof. Jerome Green, of the University of Notre Dame, unaware of Marconi's achievements in Europe a few months before, amazed a group of newsmen by successfully sending a message from the Notre Dame campus to St. Mary's, more than a mile away, on April 19, 1899.

The physical growth of the campus has kept pace with the academic development of St. Mary's. Magnificent LeMans Hall, a tasteful combination of administrative offices, resident rooms, and classrooms, was built in 1926 at a cost of \$1,250,000 and a home economics practice home was erected in 1939.

The college marked the centenary of the founding of the Sisters of the Holy Cross with the building of a 90,000-volume library in 1941. A new 30-room science hall will be dedicated on April 23, 1955, as one of the major events of the year's centenary program and a modern fine arts building and auditorium will be begun on February 26, 1955, as a centenary project.

Sister M. Madeleva, CSC, current president of St. Mary's, succeeded to the presidency of the college in 1934. A world-renowned poet and educator, Sister Madeleva has had a strong influence on the intellectual and physical growth of St. Mary's.

Under her guidance, St. Mary's in 1944 established the Nation's first graduate school of sacred theology for laywomen and sisters. This pioneering graduate school, under papal approbation, offers the master's degree and doctorate in religion and a number of summer schools of theology have been opened throughout the country as a result of Sister Madeleva's inspiration.

St. Mary's College, in its centenary year, now ranks as the largest resident Catholic women's college in America.

St. Mary's offers courses leading to the degree of bachelor of arts, bachelor of music, and bachelor of science.

The Republican Valley Conservation Association

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. CARL T. CURTIS

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 4, 1955

Mr. CURTIS. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a statement prepared by me, entitled "The Republican Valley Conservation Association."

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

THE REPUBLICAN VALLEY CONSERVATION ASSOCIATION

(Statement by Senator CURTIS)

I should like to take a few minutes today to call the attention of this body to a very

important development which is taking place out in Nebraska. I refer to the reorganization of the Republican Valley Conservation Association, which has made great strides during the past 15 years, and has built a reputation for effective promotion of flood control and irrigation in the upper Republican River watershed.

Many Senators will recall the disastrous flood of 1935, when 112 persons were drowned and tens of millions of dollars of property loss sustained in southwestern Nebraska. It is interesting to note that the numerous flood-control conferences which were called through the years, to deal with the perennial flood threat, found Gov. Arthur Weaver, of Nebraska, among the most active advocates of a complete program of flood control from the headwaters down. Congressman PHIL WEAVER, who succeeded me in that great First District of Nebraska, is the son of the illustrious Governor, and has taken up the campaign where his father left off, determined to complete the job that is so nicely under way. The whole decade of the thirties witnessed repeated droughts and floods. Frequently, as in 1935, heavy floods would be suffered in the spring, then the crops would be lost that fall as a result of drought. Clearly, the only possible method of stabilizing agriculture in that area lay in a program involving the storage of floodwaters in the spring, which could subsequently be spread upon the land in the summer months in the form of supplemental irrigation. For instance, during the year just passed (1954), this territory received less than 10 inches of moisture. To meet this challenge, many of the State's outstanding citizens have come forward and put their shoulders to the wheel.

Nebraska has furnished many outstanding workers in the field of reclamation. C. Petrus Peterson, of Lincoln, is currently serving as president of the National Reclamation Association and one of the greatest authorities nationally on irrigation from ground water sources is Dr. E. C. Condra of the State University, Lincoln. Also, the lower Republican River has had its share of illustrious leaders who have unselfishly devoted their efforts to the furtherance of such a program. Any such list would have to include Oswin Kelfer, of Superior, the late Paul Spence, of Red Cloud; Ben Harrington, Leon Sprague, and Halpert Thomas. Also, northwestern Nebraska, and the Platte River territory generally, have brought forward their own group of men who have helped mightily to make our State a better place in which to live.

But no group has ever launched a program of action with as many strikes against them as did the Republican Valley Conservation Association. The organization was formed in McCook in 1940 under the vigorous presidency of Harry D. Strunk, who himself served as director for many years, representing Nebraska on the board of the National Reclamation Association. The Republican Valley group was told by the United States Corps of Engineers that no flood protection was possible in the upper Republican, inasmuch as the valley possessed no satisfactory sites for dams and reservoirs. This would have stopped men of lesser courage. I am rather proud that, responding to a request of that body, I personally urged a review of the reports on the upper Republican by the Engineers Corps. Also, the association sent representatives out into the field, and recorded detailed statements of landowners, setting forth the actual property losses which they had sustained in 1935 and subsequent floods. These sworn statements helped the Engineers Corps reappraise the potential flood damages, and increase its estimate of benefits which could flow from the construction of flood-control reservoirs. And, fortunately, a review of the upper Republican enabled the corps, and the Bureau of Reclamation, to come up with a list of about a dozen reservoir sites. Here, then, was the

basis for a sustained drive by which the people of that area could appeal to the Congress to reclaim their lands and usher in an era of irrigation farming.

Many other headaches confronted this little group of citizens. They immediately discovered that, because of State and Federal statutes, it would be necessary to negotiate an interstate compact between Nebraska, Kansas, and Colorado, legally apportioning, for consumptive purposes, the flow of the Republican River and its tributaries. And such a compact had to be ratified by the Congress. With the everlasting help and guidance from the late Senator Hugh Butler, together with all other members of the Nebraska congressional delegation, these initial legislative hurdles were cleared.

Then World War II broke loose. It was apparent that the United States would be fighting for its very life, and all critical materials were to be diverted to defense purposes. So it was that a good many of the members, and some of the officers of the Republican Valley Conservation Association, took the view that it would actually be unpatriotic for the organization to carry on its activities during the war period. It was proposed that they suspend their efforts until the war was over, but level heads prevailed and the group decided to carry on for, after all, a stepup in the production of food supplies comprised one of the methods by which such areas could make their maximum contribution to the Nation's welfare during that emergency period.

It was well that they continued active, because they were able to bring about Federal appropriations sufficient to complete investigations by technical agencies of the Federal Government. Thus it was that they were ready to have included in the Flood-Control Act of 1944 authorization of 10 or 12 upstream projects. Since Congress passed that measure, Enders, Medicine, Bonny, and Culbertson Dams and Reservoirs have been constructed, one by one, together with several diversion dams. This is a tremendous beginning toward a basinwide program, which will ultimately enrich that area immeasurably. Senator Butler used to say that completing the flood-control and irrigation program in the upper Republican Basin would mean more, economically, than striking oil in southwestern Nebraska.

But as the years went by, some of the original band of loyal sponsors of the program, including Dr. M. Campbell, of McCook, treasurer, and P. N. Foster, director, from Imperial, passed away. The organization encountered considerable difficulty in meeting its moderate financial requirements. Some of the leaders have been obliged to invest substantial amounts of their own money in order to keep a vigorous program running. McCook, the headquarters of the organization, has always contributed a good deal more than its proportionate share among the 32 member towns. But with the firm backing of the McCook Chamber of Commerce, under the presidency of Joe Rothmeier, a special committee has now been named, including Ralph G. Stevens, John Van Auker, Elwood C. Ackerman, and Ben Hormel.

Also, a few of the forward-looking business firms in Lincoln, Omaha, Kansas City, and Denver have made modest contributions through the years. Unquestionably, it is to their enlightened self-interest that they do so. After all, more than \$100 million of Federal funds alone have been expended to date in the upper Republican, and \$50 million to \$75 million remain to be spent before the job is finished. This will treble the farm production in that area. Supplemental irrigation brings in sugar beets, potatoes, increased corn crops, and multiplies materially all phases of livestock production. Growth of these crops also brings, in its wake, the processing plants needed to handle such

products. Further, completion of the job will step up the population and the buying power materially, and it will provide permanent protection against recurring floods. All of these things are important within the market area of Omaha, Denver, and Lincoln. By the way, irrigation is universally conceded to be the biggest single factor which has caused population in the 17 States to increase nearly 2½ times as fast as population in the 31 Eastern States during the last 50 years. Without irrigation, western Nebraska would undoubtedly have lost population heavily in the decade of the thirties and subsequently.

One of the principal reasons that I wished to speak today was to urge that the Congress give sympathetic consideration of the proposal for appropriations for investigations by the Engineers Corps and the Bureau of Reclamation, not only in Nebraska but elsewhere in the Nation. It seems to me that we should have a reservoir of projects built up, from those which are found practical and feasible, so that construction can be inaugurated at the earliest possible date. You are all undoubtedly aware of the fact that President Eisenhower himself has said, "I am recommending increased funds for general investigations by the Bureau of Reclamation to insure a proper basis for project authorization." We must have investigational moneys from which detailed investigations can be undertaken on the Red Willow, the Pioneer, either Wray or Parks, and along those three Kansas tributaries, the Beaver, Sappa, and Prairie Dog, which enter the Republican below Oxford. It has already been 11 years since these projects were authorized by the Congress, but no detailed investigations have yet been undertaken.

I want to emphasize today that I am especially ambitious for this program because of the great record which the Republican Valley Conservation Association has made in its efforts to develop southwestern Nebraska, northwestern Kansas, and southeastern Colorado. Not only has Harry Strunk continued to serve as president in the intervening 15 years, giving unselfishly of his time and energies, but he has been surrounded by other good citizens who, likewise, have made a great contribution.

Mr. Strunk has stepped aside now, and become chairman of the board of directors of his organization, welcoming to the presidency H. E. Robinson, who just retired as director of the Kansas River District, Bureau of Reclamation. It was he who built these projects that today stand as a monument to them, and to the farsighted Members of this Congress who have appropriated the necessary funds. And it is Harold Sutton, one of McCook's real leaders, who today serves as treasurer of the organization. And there is another man who has served the group extremely well through the years. He is M. O. Ryan, who served as executive secretary of the organization from 1940 until World War II struck, in 1942. Since 1943, while being otherwise employed in Washington, his extensive knowledge of the entire area and of the complex problems involved has made his judgment invaluable to the Federal agencies and to the Nebraska congressional delegation as they sought to push this program forward.

There are some who maintain that Federal appropriations for development of western areas must be reduced. Let me point out that W. A. Dexheimer, Commissioner, Bureau of Reclamation, states that for the fiscal year of 1954, all appropriations for reclamation construction through the 17 Western States comprised only one-fourth of 1 percent of the national budget. Geographically that is more than one-third of the land area of this country. Of course, President Eisenhower has already asked Congress for a somewhat larger allocation of funds for the fiscal year beginning next July 1. In addition to funds to step up navigation facilities

on the Missouri River, which runs through eastern Nebraska, and for the construction of agricultural levees at numerous points, an appropriation is asked for a multiple-purpose power project at Gavins Point, Nebr. And then, in the field of reclamation, the President is asking more than \$10 million in appropriations for the Bostwick, the Frenchman-Cambridge, and the Sargent projects in Nebraska.

Appropriations alone do not meet the total needs, however. Refinements in our Federal statutes must be made from time to time. Already, during the 84th Congress, I have joined hands with 11 other Senators from the Great Plains, including my colleague Senator Hauska, in introducing S. 787, which paves the way for the negotiation of a compact to achieve maximum conservation and development of water resources throughout the Missouri Basin. Also, I have joined with seven other Republican Senators from west of the 100th meridian, in introducing S. 863, which strengthens the control of the individual Western States over navigable and unnavigable waters within their boundaries. Such a bill appears necessary in order to clarify the nebulous area between State and Federal jurisdiction over reclamation and flood-control activities.

Also, my esteemed colleague, Congressman A. L. MILLER, of Nebraska, who is the ranking Republican member of the House Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs, has reintroduced a bill which he proposed in the last session, which is now numbered H. R. 1824, clarifying national policy in regard to the development of certain water resources. These are among the measures which Congress will need to enact if we are to meet our full responsibility in paving the way for maximum development of arid lands throughout the West.

A watershed like the Republican is honeycombed with many small creeks and streams. In between the major tributaries, upon which larger projects can be built by the Engineers Corps and the Bureau of Reclamation, lie innumerable smaller streams, each of which provides a flood threat. The Soil Conservation Service, an integral part of the United States Department of Agriculture, is geared to treat these areas with small retardation dams. My mind goes back to 1950, when Senator Kenneth Wherry, an active member of the Senate Appropriations Committee, personally inspired the first appropriation of \$500,000 for the Soil Conservation Service to undertake surveys to ascertain those watersheds where feasible projects existed. Our late Congressman Karl Stefan, who was simultaneously serving on the House Appropriations Committee, put his shoulder to the wheel, and both bodies of Congress approved that appropriation. From the resulting survey, the first of a number of pilot projects are ready for construction in 1955. The McCook Gazette of January 26 gave a map, in complete detail, of Dry Creek watershed project, the first in that area to be constructed under the Hope-Aiken Watershed Protection Act, which was passed by the 83d Congress. These projects do take time, but once constructed, they last a lifetime.

Commissioner Dexheimer offers concrete evidence of the national value which reclamation projects offer to our United States economy. He reports that Federal-tax revenues from reclamation areas, since 1916, have exceeded \$3 billion. This sum alone exceeds by 25 percent the total cost of all Bureau-constructed projects in the past 50 years, or since the Reclamation Bureau was established. Not only do landowners on reclamation projects enjoy enhanced revenues, as a result of irrigation, but the adjoining urban areas share substantially in the increased revenue. As an example, in 1953 reclamation project farmers had an income of \$550 million, whereas the nonfarming urban areas, which had these projects

in their immediate vicinity, enjoyed total income of approximately \$786 million.

We have reason to rejoice this year over the fact that hundreds of additional acres of fertile land in the Missouri basin will be brought under supplemental irrigation for the first time. Completion of the last 50 miles of irrigation canals on the Frenchman-Cambridge project, east of Cambridge, and the 13-mile Franklin Canal on the Bostwick project, jointly account for very substantial acreage in southwestern Nebraska which will be irrigated this year for the first time.

To my way of thinking, these groups like the Republican Valley Conservation Association are the only device by which 32 member communities, or whole sections of a State, can pull themselves up by their own bootstraps. I think that the modest support required from chambers of commerce, city councils, and county commissioners, to maintain such organizations, comprise one of the best possible investments in the future welfare of any State.

As I stand here today, I am concerned about the fact that the Department of Agriculture reports more than 26 million acres of farm land in the whole dust bowl area are in condition to blow this spring. In many areas the Great Plains are experiencing the worst drought since the decade of the thirties. Without adequate snow cover, and frequent spring rains, the Dust Bowl could be revived before root fiber from the 1955 crop affords protection against wind erosion. This perennial threat will be with us constantly until we have brought the benefits of supplemental irrigation to the maximum acreage possible, and stepped up the volume of cover crops and legumes which effectively anchor the soil.

Let me confide something to this great body, the United States Senate. The very last day he was alive, our beloved Hugh Butler spent the afternoon in his office conferring with top level officials, seeking ways and means to step up the tempo of this program in the upper Republican watershed in Nebraska. I was there, as were Secretary McKay and other officials of the Department of the Interior. That night he was stricken, and died 24 hours later. To Mr. Strunk and Mr. Robinson, and the directors from the individual cities and towns that comprise the association, I send greetings, confident that they will continue to enjoy the support of all city, county, and State officials. Their efforts will forever remove the threat of repeated floods, and will temper the droughts, and thus stabilize the economy as nothing else in that whole area can do.

I trust that this important program may go forward to completion.

Peace Through Power

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK CARLSON

OF KANSAS

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Friday, March 4, 1955

Mr. CARLSON. Mr. President, I ask unanimous consent to have printed in the RECORD a speech entitled "Peace Through Power," delivered by the Assistant Secretary of Defense, Fred A. Seaton, at Kansas State College at Manhattan on February 9.

On this occasion Secretary Seaton was awarded by Kansas State College at Manhattan the honorary doctor of laws degree.

Manhattan is the home town of the Secretary and he is a graduate of Kansas State College.

Secretary Seaton is a successful businessman and newspaper publisher who has had an outstanding career in public life. At the present time he publishes newspapers in Kansas, Nebraska, Colorado, Wyoming, and South Dakota. Through these mediums he wields great influence for the building of our Nation and the strengthening of our democracy.

There being no objection, the address was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

PEACE THROUGH POWER

You are all familiar with the general aspects of our present world situation. You know the story of the spread of Communist influence and power from a numerically insignificant Russian political party prior to the October 1917 revolution to its present dominion, over 800 million people arranged over one-fourth the land area of the world.

In response to the common threat to their security, more than 40 of the nations of the world, including our own have allied themselves in several regional defense agreements.

The two blocs—the Communists and the free world alliance—now face each other across a narrowing world, and compete for the support of those nations which have not as yet committed themselves to the struggle.

The seat of military power of the Communist bloc is the Soviet Union. In terms of ground strength, this amounts to a standing army of 175 divisions, to which must be added the 70 divisions of the European satellites. Communist China, furthermore, has more than 2 million men under arms. The amount of manpower the two principals could eventually mobilize is suggested by the fact that during the latter part of World War II, the Soviet Union had on its western front an active strength of over 400 divisions, and, further, on conservative estimates, that the Chinese military manpower pool amounts to over 20 million men. In contrast, at the peak of its military strength in 1945, the United States had 95 divisions (89 Army and 6 Marines) under arms.

On the sea, the Soviet Union commands virtually all the effective strength of the Communist bloc. Its submarine fleet consists of at least 375 vessels, 75 of which are long-range fleet types. It possesses 125 modern destroyers, and 24 cruisers, 15 of which are known to be modern, combat-worthy types. So far as we know, the Russians possess no aircraft carriers but we cannot dismiss the possibility that some may be under construction. Since World War II, the Soviet Union has built more combatant ships—destroyers, cruisers, and submarines—than all of the free world put together.

In the matter of air strength, we estimate the Soviet Union to have an inventory of over 1,000 TU-4 bombardment aircraft, which are copies of our own B-29's. If we credit the Soviet air commands with the capability of in-flight refueling, which seems reasonable, it means that a substantial number of our vital cities and installations come within their range. And, of course, on a one-way mission, they could reach almost any target in the United States, if confronted with no opposition. We know also that the Soviet has an undisclosed but growing number of medium and long-range jet bombers, and that they are producing a better fighter than the MIG 15, which was used in Korea. Their total number of aircraft of all kinds exceeds 20,000, most of them tactical types—fighters, interceptors, and light bombers.

As you know, this brief recital of military means at its disposal in no way describes the true dimension and nature of the threat which comes from the Soviet sphere. Pol-

icy decisions in the Kremlin have resulted in a world situation which has influenced us to allocate since June 1950, a staggering portion of our national substance and effort valued at \$220 billion to the economically unproductive purposes of defense. Today, 60 percent of your Federal taxes go for the equipping and maintenance of a 3-million-man armed force.

The Communists know as well as we that the physical basis of all our military power is our economy, and that if this economy can be undermined and sabotaged, the effect may well be as disastrous to us as a major military defeat. We must not permit this to occur.

Moreover, we must also contend with the insidious threat of subversion, sabotage, and espionage within our own country and the countries of our allies, which can sap the strength and vigor of the most enlightened democracy. Externally, there is the continuous pressure of political and psychological warfare, of deceit and bluff and blackmail. All these are also part of the total threat, physical and moral, which militant communism poses to freemen.

Obviously this threat, total as it is in scope, cannot be successfully countered by military means alone. But the provision of adequate military strength, particularly for the years immediately ahead, is an indispensable prerequisite to every other action which we must undertake. We must maintain military forces in being sufficient to deter aggression, either limited or unlimited, or in the event we are attacked, to preserve the minimum territorial and military security essential to successful mobilization and subsequent prosecution of the war. Moreover, we must be organized for smooth and rapid mobilization of our material and human resources.

This military capability to handle ourselves under any and all possible situations is the essential shield upon which we must rely to provide the protective sanction to the political, economic, and psychological pressures we must continue to exert against the Communist regimes.

To this end we have developed over the past 4 years a very potent military force. It is in fact, the most powerful we have ever maintained in time of peace. We have a Navy second to none, with its own steadily growing atomic striking potential. Our large and growing Air Force now consists of 119 wings which will increase steadily toward an ultimate goal of a minimum of 137 wings by 1957. We have a mobile amphibious striking force of 3 Marine divisions and 3 Marine air wings. With the cessation of fighting in Korea, our Army has gradually been reoriented toward a June 1956 strength objective of approximately 1,027,000 men. This represents a decrease of about one-third from the average strength during the Korean operations, but it remains well over 80 percent above the pre-Korean level.

And here I would like to talk briefly about this matter of ground strength, if I may. One of the foundation stones of our military policy is that our strength shall be integrated with that of our allies in such a way that the maximum power potential is made available to the community of allies. Throughout all these alliances there runs the understanding, written or otherwise, that each partner will contribute to the common cause those elements of strength which it is best able to supply, and to the limit that it is able to supply them.

In this great global system of alliances in which we participate, our Nation is peculiarly well suited to supply two vital elements—sea power and the striking capability of long-range land based air power. Our contribution in these particular categories is by all odds the preponderant one. We also have made a substantial contribution in ground strength, but in the very nature of things we cannot hope to supply more

than a small part of the total number of troops required. The basic accounting unit of a land army is the man. Which suggests that within the special situation obtaining in each strategic area, the contribution in ground strength must bear a general relationship to the population of each interested nation. So we greatly understate the total ground strength available for our common defense effort if we do not count the very substantial contributions of our allies.

To our own 19 divisions should be added at least a hundred more which the free world could count on in any major war undertaken by the Soviet bloc. NATO presently has available to it an active ground strength equivalent of 48 divisions. The Republic of Korea has approximately 19 battle-tested divisions within a total force of 400,000 men. Japan has initiated the formation of its national security police force, and the Philippines have reestablished internal order and are rapidly building up their strength. The 12 West German divisions are to come. We feel, militarily, well able to take care of ourselves in the event of actual physical attack, provided we conduct our operations along lines which permit us to oppose our own factors of strength against the Soviet factors of weakness.

And this, I think, is the key to the success of our whole defense effort. There are certain areas in which we are greatly superior to the Soviet—our powerful and versatile economy, the depth and breadth of our technology, the enormous fire power and mobility assured by our intensive development of atomic weapons and our control of the seas. Most important of all, there is the universal appeal of the great system of values we have moved to defend, as contrasted to the total disregard for human life and liberty which necessarily underlies the Communist philosophy.

It is of great significance to me that in 1952 United States produced half again as much coal as the Soviet, $2\frac{1}{2}$ times as much steel, 4 times as much electric power, 7 times as much oil, and 20 times as many automobiles and trucks. While free American agriculture was bringing in record crops, the Soviet staggered lamely along at about its level of 25 years ago. I am sure you would be interested as I was, in knowing that the USSR, still largely an agricultural nation, consumes more grain than it harvests, that its cattle population is 10 million below what it was in 1928, that its pork production has dropped by 5 million tons since 1940; that by its own admission the supply of meat, potatoes, and vegetables is unsatisfactory.

Our allies, on the other hand, have set remarkable records of food production. England now produces a surprising 56 percent of her food needs whereas she formerly imported about 80 percent. France and Turkey are now producing surpluses of wheat. Wherever free enterprise operates free men always win the battle of production.

I derive a keen sense of satisfaction in the marvelous technology which both supports and depends upon our economic system—the same technology which daily enriches our lives in its thousands of peacetime applications, but which when the chips were down could bring forth such vital weapons of war as radar, the VT fuze, and the atomic bomb.

But, most of all, I sense the great latent strength of a society whose goals represent the highest hopes and greatest expectations of men throughout the world—values which men the world over have repeatedly shown themselves ready to lay down their lives to obtain and defend—a sense of dignity for the individual, the right to worship, to speak, and to think as freemen, to have the love of family and friends, to enjoy the love of the land, and of one's ancestral home, the right to participate freely in a government of their own choosing, and to stand as equals before the eyes of the law. These deep and abiding aspirations we hold in common with

all people, and in no way can the barren, atheistic philosophy of communism claim them as basic or even a fundamental part of its ideology.

In contrast, the Soviet has nothing to rely upon except force—force of the most brutal and callous sort. Many of you have read of our President's account of his deep shock when, as General Eisenhower, he learned from a high-ranking Soviet officer the Russian Army technique of clearing minefields. "When we come to a minefield," the Soviet officer told him, "our infantry attacks exactly as if it were not there. The losses we get from personnel mines we consider only equal to the losses we would have gotten from machine guns and artillery if the Germans had chosen to defend that particular area with strong bodies of troops instead of with minefields." This may be logical from a coldly analytical military viewpoint, but it is hardly logical in light of the fact that any regime, even a dictatorship, depends for its existence over the long term upon a certain minimum degree of acceptance by the people over which it exercises its authority. To me it shows weakness, not strength.

Nevertheless, there are certain areas in which we must concede the advantage to the Soviet bloc. Their numbers far exceed the combined strength of ourselves and our allies in sheer military manpower. Moreover, a differential population increase is presently weighing the manpower balance further in their favor, so that it may be expected to become more and more unfavorable to us as time goes by, unless we can associate ourselves with additional allies. In World Wars I and II, our side had a very substantial numerical superiority, and this advantage had its influence in shaping our strategy and tactics in those two great conflicts. But the reverse will be true of any conflict which may be fought out on the present alignment of world power and this tremendously important fact demands our close and continued study.

The only logical remedy for a situation in which we cannot match the enemy man for man lies in the development of capabilities which nullify this enemy advantage. Fortunately, the controlling element in military operations is not mere manpower, but effective firepower, delivered at the time and place of decision. And in the development of such firepower, and the means of its effective delivery, our technology and our massive economy give us a long lead over our nearest competitors. Our arsenal of atomic weapons ranges from giants in the megaton range, which is to say the equivalent of 1 million tons of TNT, down to small tactical weapons which can be fired from guns for relatively limited effect. We have them in increased supply. The Army, Navy, and Air Force all are busily engaged in perfecting the tactics and techniques of employing these tremendous new additions to our military capability.

In the battlefield employment of atomic weapons the effectiveness of our Army has been enormously increased by the 280-millimeter atomic gun, the Honest John rocket, and the Corporal guided missile. All these powerful innovations are now available to our ground forces in Europe, and the recent North Atlantic Council meeting in Paris gave its approval to the proposal that atomic weapons be fully integrated into the basic strategic concept for the defense of Western Europe. It is our deep and earnest belief that the devastating curtain of fire which we shall be able to call down upon the enemy hordes will enable us to keep any would-be invader out of Western Europe and thus deny him his prize.

Measured in our capability to project destruction in the form of rockets, missiles, and bombs, our firepower in the air increases daily. The last B-29 has been retired from active service, and our long-range bombers

now are mainly the jet B-47's and the combination jet and propeller-driven B-36's. The B-52's, a superb long-range jet bomber, is being received in increasing numbers and will eventually replace the B-36.

A point frequently overlooked is the fact that the capability of delivering massive firepower is not confined to the Strategic Air Command alone. Our Tactical Air Command also has a tremendous atomic capability. All the fighters and light bombers of the TAC will be able to carry either high explosives or atomic bombs, depending on what the target requires. All of its wings are modern, and all of its fighters are jets, in the high subsonic speed ranges. Our new fighter interceptor aircraft now in production, beginning with the F-100, will have supersonic speeds. Moreover, our great mobile airfields, the Navy aircraft carriers, have comparatively unrestricted access to the seven-tenths of the earth's surface which is covered by water, and can bring their sea-borne atomic striking forces to bear upon targets deep in the interior of the enemy's homeland.

We review this vast power which is ours with mixed feelings.

We can derive great satisfaction and confidence from the enormous increase which it represents over the power which was available to us even a scant 10 years ago. Yet we are sobered by the contemplation of where our weapons technology may lead us in the decade which lies ahead. Moreover, our problem is complicated by the fact that we neither can nor will prepare for initiating war as a conscious act of national policy. Adhering to our moral code, as a nation we can only prepare for the eventuality that war may be forced upon us under unknown conditions at an uncertain future date. Thus, the element of chance in the preparatory phase of war is inherently larger in the case of democracies than it is with dictatorships, for we cannot with certainty predict when war will occur, if at all. We cannot predict, except within the general limits, the method of attack, or the exact direction from which it may come. Nor can we now foresee very far into the future the political arrangements which may result from the use of military pressures exerted by an aggressor prior to the outbreak of hostilities. These things we cannot know. We can know only that in this lawless world we must be prepared to fight at any time, with weapons that are better than those which will be used against us.

As a result, in the area of weapons procurement, we dare not put all, or even most of our eggs, in one basket. We dare not load our Armed Forces down with weapons which may, at best, have begun to be or become obsolescent even before the last lot has been delivered. The best that we can possibly hope for is to keep our weapons stocks at a level which will enable us to fight effectively with what we have, meanwhile pushing out the older versions with newer, more efficient models as they become available from an economy that has never been known to stand still.

There are those who constantly agitate for more of everything now—more planes, more guns, more of this and more of that. Sincere as they may be, they fail to take into account either the economic or the military problems involved. To over-burden our economy is to risk losing the struggle against communism without firing a shot. To overload the services with obsolete equipment is to risk defeat in battle. True war readiness consists in being able not only to fight today's war with today's weapons, but of being ready to fight tomorrow's war with tomorrow's weapons. This requires a sensible balance in weapons programming. And that, we now believe we have achieved.

This, I think, is the thing which we must keep always in mind in all our defense considerations. For our national security is

not tied to a date on a calendar, or to a certain specified number of divisions, ships, planes, or men. It is not to be identified with any one type of weapon or any one strategic approach. Rather, it depends upon our continuing and increasing ability to meet successfully a variety of challenges—military, political, and economic—while maintaining the essential soundness and health of our economy and our political system. And this we must be prepared to do perhaps for 50 years to come.

There is nothing transitory about the threat to our Nation and our way of life, and there is nothing cheap or easy or simple about the things which we must do to protect and preserve them. These difficult and

costly measures which we must undertake in our defense will demand the very best that is in us, the people of America. Among these responsibilities will be your own part in the great common effort we all must make to maintain our military readiness, our political solidarity, and our industrial and technological superiority over that of any possible enemy.

If we can do these things, we have an excellent chance for peace, and an accommodation between the free world and the Communist bloc which will effectively serve our interests.

From a plateau of great strength we can negotiate for the easing of tensions and the reduction of trouble areas dangerous to world

stability. For many years, it may be a peace, not of good will, but of power, in which our national strength will be the validating factor. But it will be a peace in which free men can live and breathe, and pursue those ends which tend to lessen the misery and increase the sum of human happiness in the world. It can, at the least, be a peace which will stop the flow of the Red tide which has engulfed so much of the world, and the opening of a more hopeful prospect for democracy than the one it has faced these past 20 years.

This is the peace which we must have, and can have, provided we remain patient, united, and strong.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

MONDAY, MARCH 7, 1955

The House met at 12 o'clock noon.

The Chaplain, Rev. Bernard Braskamp, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, the sovereign ruler of the universe, Thy wise and beneficent laws are the inspiration and foundation of every just and righteous human law.

Grant that the laws, which are made and adopted here in this Chamber by the legislative branch of our Government, may always be in accord with the plan and pattern of Thy divine law.

May we daily be inspired with a lofty sense of respect and reverence for the sacred office of the Chief Executive of these United States.

We beseech Thee that our President, our Speaker, and all who are engaged in the high vocation of statecraft may be richly endowed with special gifts of wisdom and understanding and leadership.

May the citizens of our beloved country be great in loyalty and obedience to law, in righteousness and in peace and may our national strength and resources be used for the good of mankind.

Hear us in the name of the Prince of Peace. Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, March 3, 1955, was read and approved.

MESSAGE FROM THE PRESIDENT

A message in writing from the President of the United States was communicated to the House by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Carrell, one of its clerks, announced that the Senate had passed a bill of the following title, in which the concurrence of the House is requested:

S. 752. An act to amend section 102 (a) of the Agricultural Trade Development and Assistance Act of 1954, so as to eliminate the requirement that privately owned stocks exported thereunder be replaced from Commodity Credit Corporation stocks.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled

"An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 55-8.

The message also announced that the Vice President has appointed Mr. JOHNSTON of South Carolina and Mr. CARLSON members of the joint select committee on the part of the Senate, as provided for in the act of August 5, 1939, entitled "An act to provide for the disposition of certain records of the United States Government," for the disposition of executive papers referred to in the report of the Archivist of the United States numbered 55-9.

SPECIAL ORDERS GRANTED

Mr. PATMAN asked and was given permission to address the House for 20 minutes today, following any special orders heretofore entered and to revise and extend his remarks and include certain statements and extraneous matter.

Mrs. FOST asked and was given permission to address the House for 25 minutes tomorrow, following the legislative business of the day and any special orders heretofore entered.

Mrs. GREEN of Oregon asked and was given permission to address the House for 25 minutes tomorrow, following any special orders heretofore entered.

THE HONORABLE MARY T. NORTON

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend my remarks.

The SPEAKER. Is there objection to the request of the gentleman from New Jersey?

There was no objection.

Mr. TUMULTY. Mr. Speaker, I rise to call the attention of the House to the fact that today is the 80th birthday of that distinguished lady, Mary T. Norton, who represented the 13th District of New Jersey for so many years so gloriously and so well. As a resident of the city of Jersey City and one who lived in her district so many years, I felt it would be a great honor and privilege to remind you of her great work, which you all know, her wonderful achievements in the field of labor.

All of us in Jersey City remember her affectionately and I thought the House would be very much pleased to know that

she is celebrating her 80th birthday today, that she is in excellent health, and that she thinks many times of the great friendships she made here, and of her friends in this body.

Mr. McCORMACK. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TUMULTY. I yield.

Mr. McCORMACK. I wish to associate myself with the remarks of my good friend from New Jersey [Mr. TUMULTY]. I sent Mary Norton a letter of congratulation on her birthday anniversary today. I am very happy that the gentleman from New Jersey made the remarks he did.

Those who served with Mary Norton remember her not only as a sweet lady, but also as a great American, one of the outstanding Members of this body. She served with devotion and courage the people of her district, of her State, and of our country, and I join with her many friends in congratulating Mrs. Norton on her birthday anniversary. I hope that God will continue to shower upon her for many years to come an abundance of His choicest blessings.

Mr. TUMULTY. I thank the gentleman from Massachusetts, for whom Mrs. Norton had great affection, as well as for the Speaker of this House. I may say that my first knowledge of this House came from Mrs. Norton and from her praise of the work done by you, Mr. Majority Leader, and the Speaker [Mr. RAYBURN], as well as by the minority leader [Mr. MARTIN].

Mr. Speaker, the Honorable Mary Theresa Norton was born and brought up and lives today in the congressional district she represented. She is a widow, having lost her husband, Robert Francis Norton, a businessman of Jersey City, several years ago.

Mrs. Norton attended parochial and public high school in Jersey City and business college in New York. Previous to her marriage, she was a secretary and businesswoman, and believes that this experience has been of great help to her during her public career. She became interested in welfare work in 1912 upon the death of her only child, a son. She was one of the founders of the Queen's Daughters Day Nursery, a volunteer non-sectarian day nursery, furnishing care during World War I to thousands of children of working mothers. She was president of the nursery for more than 12 years, resigning a few years following her election to Congress. Through her knowledge of welfare work and its de-